DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 701 CG 012 318

TITLE Sex Role Stereotyping in the Schools. Revised Edition.
SPONS AGENCY National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 125p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bias; *Classroom Environment; Counselor Role; Curriculum; Educational Counseling; *Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; Politics; Research Reviews (Publications); *School Community Relationship; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

This book on sex role stereotyping in the schools is divided into two parts. Part One concerns the school and the classroom, and addresses such topics as sexist language, biased textbooks, educational guidance, sex roles, politics, athletics, the counselor's challenge, and the curriculum. Part Two concerns the school and the community, and discusses equality, ERA, career outlook, Title Nine, and the Dualist Theory of Human Resources. (Author/JLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151701

Sex Role Stereotyping in the Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THI
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONL'
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AN
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Revised Edition

CG012318

A National Education Association Publication

Copyright © 1977, 1973
National Education Association of the United States

Stock No. 0578-3-10

Note
The opinions expressed in this publication should not be construed as representing the policy or position of the National Education Association. It is intended to be a discussion document for teachers who are concerned with specialized interests of the profession.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Sex role stereotyping in the schools.

Includes bibliographical references.
1. Sex differences in education—Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. Sex role—Addresses, essays, lectures.
LB1117.S42 370.15 73-1679

Acknowledgments
NEA gratefully acknowledges the permissions given to use the following: •"Images of Males and Females in Elementary School Textbooks in Five Subject Areas" by Lenore J. Weitzman and Diane Rizzo. Reprinted from *Biased Textbooks*. Copyright © 1974 by The National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. •"Roles, Labels, Stereotypes: A Counselor's Challenge" by Barbara Cook. Reprinted from *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, Spring 1971. •"Sex Stereotyping in Educational Guidance" by Phyllis Zatlin Boring. Reprinted from *NJEA Review*. Copyright © 1973 by New Jersey Education Association. •"Sexual Politics in the Classroom" by Sheila Tobias. Reprinted from *51% Minority*. •"What You Can Do About Biased Textbooks" by Shirley McCune. Reprinted from *Biased Textbooks*. Copyright © 1974 by The National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. •"The White Male Club" by Robert Terry. Reprinted from *Civil Rights Digest*, Spring 1974. Copyright © 1974 by Robert Terry. Used with permission.

Contents

Part One: The School and the Classroom

1. Sexism in Language: The Case for Including Everybody 1
Carole Schulte Johnson

2. What You Can Do About Biased Textbooks 9
Shirley McCune

3. Sex Stereotyping in Educational Guidance 14
Phyllis Zatlin Boring

4. A Child's-Eye View of Sex Roles 23
Lynne B. Iglitzin

5. Sexual Politics in the Classroom 31
Sheila Tobias

6. School Athletics and Sex Discrimination 36
Kathryn F. Clarenbach

7. Roles, Labels, Stereotypes: A Counselor's Challenge 40
Barbara Cook

8. Alternatives to a Sexist Curriculum 50
Rose M. Somerville

9. Images of Males and Females in Elementary School Textbooks in Five Subject Areas 57
Lenore J. Weitzman and *Diane Rizzo*

10. The White Male Club 68
Robert Terry

Part Two: The School and the Community

11. All Men Are Created Equal 87
12. ERA—Let the Record Speak 92
13. Careers and Occupational Outlook 100
14. Title IX of the Education Amendments, 1972 103
15. Title IX and Grievance Procedures 108
16. The Dualist Theory of Human Resources 113

Selected References 117

1. Sexism in Language: The Case for Including Everybody

By Carole Schulte Johnson

Why are men who are forgetful called absent minded while forgetful women are called scatterbrain? Why are men who are interested in everything referred to as curious but women of the same type are called nosy? Most people agree, as the foregoing illustrates, that word choices are a subtle way of stereotyping. That aspect of language, although important, is not the sole way that language can evoke biased responses. This discussion is centered on one aspect of language which tends to engender bias, the traditional generic usage in the English language. The question must be asked: Is traditional generic usage in language simply one of preference, or are there implications, beyond mere preference, which ought to be taken seriously by educators?

Ms. Johnson made an oral presentation of this material at the 1977 Annual Convention of the International Reading Association.

The position presented here is that traditional generic usage constitutes exclusionary language: that is, it excludes females in effect, if not by intent, because words such as policeman and mailman, allegedly gender-generic, tend to be interpreted as being gender-specific. Terms such as saleswomen exclude males in effect as well as by intent. Inclusionary language, on the other hand, does not exclude, either by intent or effect, on the basis of sex.

Writers from various disciplines, for example, linguists (Key, 1972; Lakoff, 1972), social scientists (Bosmajian, 1972; Kidd, 1971), educators (Burr, Dunn and Farquhar, 1972; Tiedt, 1973), and a theologian (Russell, 1976), have written on the subject of language bias and have included the generic use of pronouns and "man" in their analyses.

Several studies are of special interest because subjects were asked to react to different ways of using language. Kidd had college students respond to 18 statements in which the masculine pronoun and "man" were used in traditional generic fashion. They identified each pronoun antecedent according to several characteristics, including sex. The first nine statements were open-ended so that the sex of the referent would be identified as either male or female or both.

> The potentialities of *man* are infinitely varied and exciting.
>
> Social Status ____ Financial Position ____ Sex ____
> Race ____

The second nine statements were in a forced-choice format:

> How can we help a child to know his feelings? We can do so by providing a mirror to *his* emotions.
>
> a. female-male
> b. successful-unsuccessful
> c. white-black
> d. rich-poor

Subjects did not respond inclusively to the generic pronoun "man" either in the free- or forced-choice format. In the free-choice, males were selected 407 times and females 53 times. Kidd concluded that the generic pronoun "man" is not generally interpreted as representing a neutral antecedent; it is, in fact, considered male.

College students turned in newspaper and magazine pictures to illustrate a proposed sociology textbook for Schneider and Hacker (1973). Two forms of chapter titles were used. Both contained eight common titles such as Culture and Ecology, neutral in gender. In addition, one form used five "man"-associated labels such as Industrial Man and Economic Man, while another contained comparable inclusionary titles, Industrial Life and Economic Behavior. They found that 64 percent of students receiving "man" titles submitted pictures containing only males, compared with 50 percent of those receiving the inclusionary titles. The authors concluded that a significantly large number of students did not interpret "man" generically.

Bem and Bem (1973) asked high school seniors to rate 12 job advertisements on an interested-uninterested scale. Eight ads, identical on all three forms, contained inclusionary language. The language of four telephone ads varied; operator and service representative (considered traditionally female) and frameman and lineman (considered traditionally male). The company's usual exclusionary language was used in Form I. Form II employed inclusionary language while Form III used sex-reversed exclusionary language; for example, service representative was referred to as "he" while lineman became "linewoman." Results, indicating interest in the traditional opposite-sex jobs, were as follows:

Language Form	*Women*	*Men*
Traditional exclusionary	5%	30%
Inclusionary	25	75
Sex-reversed exclusionary	45	65

Since the only difference in these ads was the language used, the conclusion that the generic is interpreted as exclusionary by many people, both male and female, seems inescapable.

Harrison and Passero (1975) investigated the extent to which third graders included females in their interpretations of traditional generic terms. Eight situations were presented; below each were four or five figure drawings. Students could circle the appropriate drawing or drawings. The test was given in two forms; one using traditional generic terms and the other neutral terms such as people, salesperson, handmade. When the traditional exclusionary language was used, 49–85 percent of the students circled male figures only. However, when neutral terms were used only 3–31 percent of the students circled all males. These values were significantly different. The authors concluded that for these children, females generally are not included within their understanding of the traditional generic terms.

Harrison (1975) had more than 500 junior high students respond to seven situations by drawing figures and giving them first names. Three forms were used: Form I (traditional generic): "Draw three examples of early man and the tools you think he used in daily life"; Form II (inclusionary terms): ". . .people. . .they. . ."; and Form III (specifically inclusionary): ". . .men and women. . . they. . ." Significant differences were found for both male and female students.

Range of Percentages of Male and Female Students
Drawing Only Male Figures on Seven Items

	Male	*Female*
Traditional generic	49–93%	11-58%
Inclusionary	22–70	5–43
Specifically inclusionary	6–64	2–17

Percent All Male Figures Drawn

	Male	*Female*
Traditional generic	42%	9%
Inclusionary	17	2
Specifically inclusionary	2	1

Not one student responded by drawing all females for every item. Also a significantly greater number of males than females drew all male figures. The author concluded that the results indicated the effectiveness of traditional generic usage in excluding females.

At seven grade levels (preschool through college) 418 students were presented with statements containing either an exclusionary or inclusionary term by Ernst (1977). Two response formats (free- and forced-choice) were used to measure each of three generic word types: traditional generic pronouns, traditional generic nouns, and inclusionary nouns. For the forced-choice format, stick figure illustrations were used and students selected one representing their mental picture of the statement. For free-response, students gave a name to the person described and answered a question about the situation.

> "A driver who tried to open his car door"
> - Give the driver a first and last name.
> - What kind of car was it?

Ernst found that with the free- and the forced-choice formats there were significantly more masculine responses for the traditional generic pronouns and nouns, while for both formats there were significantly more feminine responses for the inclusionary noun format than for the traditional generic nouns. The forced-choice format elicited significantly more feminine responses than did the free-response format for all three comparisons. The author concluded that for equal treatment and opportunity for all, there is clear evidence of the need to use inclusionary forms.

Based on this research the following conclusions are reached:

1. These studies are remarkably consistent in their findings.

2. They all agree that when traditional generic pronouns and/or nouns are used, the antecedent is more likely to be interpreted as male.

3. The studies which investigated the effect of inclusionary language found that it significantly decreased the difference between feminine and masculine responses.

4. The study by Ernst implies that inclusionary language alone is not as effective in increasing the inclusion of females as when it is used with pictures (reminders) of females.

Besides this strong research evidence, there are three other considerations. First, it is known that young children react literally to language; thus traditional language constantly shapes and reinforces the concept that boys are supposed to be in certain occupations, while girls are not. At best, traditional language fails to contradict the exclusionary concept while it does serve to reinforce it.

Second, exclusionary language is inefficient and at times misleading. It is not always clear if a term is being used in a generic sense: for example, "This book is about the history of Black men in America." At other times, it appears to be generic, but there is a switch later within the sentence to the specific: for example, "The average American does not himself manufacture most of the things his wife and children need."

Third, many occupational terms are improved by becoming better descriptors when inclusionary language is used. Examples include firefighter, garbage collector, and groundskeeper.

Based on the research evidence and these final three considerations, there can be only one logical answer to the original question. Yes, there are implications regarding traditional language usage, beyond mere preference, which ought to be taken seriously by educators.

Specific guidelines for inclusionary language have been developed by a number of publishers and national organizations. In general they suggest substituting other terms for the "man" terms and avoiding the generic use of he and his by pluralizing, by using the expression "his/her" or "her/his" or by rewriting the sentence.

The research reviewed above strongly indicates two needs: 1. The need to use inclusionary language, for example, repair worker. 2. The need to include women specifically by using both masculine and feminine terms such as "he and she," "women and men," "his/her and s/he." Educators, at all levels, who wish to affirm every individual and to encourage equal educational opportunity, will begin by modeling the use of inclusionary language in their speech and written materials.

REFERENCES

Bem, S. L., and Bem, D. J. "Does Sex-biased Job Advertising Aid and Abet Sex Discrimination?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 3:6–18; 1973.

Bosmajian, M. A. "The Language of Sexism." *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 29:305–12; Sept. 1972

Burr, E.; Dunn, S.; and Farquhar, N. "Women and the Language of Inequality." *Social Education* 36:841–45; Dec. 1972.

Ernst, S. H. B. *An Investigation of Students' Interpretation of Inclusionary and Exclusionary Gender Generic Language.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pullman: Washington State University, 1977.

Harrison, L. "Cro-Magnon Women—In Eclipse." *The Science Teacher* 42:8–11; April 1975.

Harrison, L., and Passero, R. N. "Sexism in the Language of Elementary School Textbooks." *Science and Children* 2:22–25; Jan. 1975.

Key, M. R. "Linguistic Behavior of Male and Female." *Linguistics* 88:15–31; Aug. 1972.

Kidd, V. "A Study of the Images Produced Through the Use of the Male Pronoun as the Generic." *Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication* 1:25–29; Fall 1971.

Lakoff, R. "Language and Women's Place." *Language in Society* 2:45–80; 1972.

Russell, L. M. "Changing Language and the Church." *The Liberating Word: A Guide to Nonsexist Interpretation of the Bible.* (Edited by L. M. Russell.) Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976. pp. 82–98.

Schneider, J., and Hacker, S. "Sex Role Imagery and Use of the Generic Man in Introductory Tests: A Case in the Sociology of Sociology." *American Sociologist* 8:12–18; 1972.

Tiedt, I. "Sexism in Language, An Editor's Plague." *Elementary English* 50:1073–74; Oct. 1973.

2. What You Can Do About Biased Textbooks

By Shirley McCune

Changing Stereotyped Textbooks and Their Impact

Individual awareness of racism and sexism in textbooks and instructional materials is an important first step in changing biased materials and their impact on all of us. Each of us has a responsibility for using our awareness to bring about some changes and support others who are working in this area. The following represents a checklist of the things that students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community groups can do to "act" on their awareness.

Students

Look for and learn to recognize bias that may be found in textbooks, library books, television programs, magazines, etc.

Ask your librarians to help you identify non-racist, non-sexist books. Select books that help you understand people in other cultures or situations than your own.

Point out bias in materials when you recognize it in materials you are using in school.

Do a study of your textbooks. Ask your teacher if you can do this with other students as a project or as part of your own school work.

Write letters to people who can help you learn more about bias in textbooks.

Write letters to publishers and let them know when you have found bias in textbooks.

Rewrite stories or textbooks to show how they might have been written to avoid bias or from another person's point of view.

Teachers in the Classroom

"Level" with the students in your classroom. Point out racist or sexist bias of books or materials. Help them learn to identify sources of bias and important omissions in the materials.

Develop classroom activities around identifying bias found in television, textbooks, movies, library books, magazines, etc.

Incorporate the development of critical reading skills as an instructional objective for all your teaching, not just when special efforts are being made to identify bias in materials.

Identify or develop supplementary materials which can help "correct" some of the bias of available materials.

Design student research projects. These might include a study of their own textbook materials or their identification of supplementary materials.

Assign student papers, themes, term papers, or other activities on topics or persons not usually covered in textbooks or materials.

When students have completed activities identifying bias, have them write letters and send reports to administrators, publishers, community groups, and organizations working to reduce bias in textbooks.

Invite local resource persons into your classroom to provide additional information and work with students on special projects and activities.

Ask students to rewrite materials, write their own materials on subjects omitted from the textbook, or rewrite the material from other persons' points of view.

Use bulletin boards, posters, pictures, magazines, and other materials to expose students to information commonly excluded from traditional materials.

Develop a classroom collection of non-racist, non-sexist reading materials for students. Identify books that students may be encouraged to seek out in their personal reading.

Teacher Groups

Form a committee to investigate the process of textbook selection. Where local or state groups or officials have responsibility for buying books, meet with them to learn their criteria for selection and procedures for identifying supplementary materials. Let them know your needs and sensitize them to sources of racism and sexism.

Request and use funds available for instructional materials in building supplementary materials resources for your classrooms/schools.

Develop a plan and organize in-service training sessions on biased textbooks and instructional materials. Several sessions should be included to deal with identifying racism and sexism, methods of analyzing materials, developing supplementary materials, and classroom activities for identifying bias.

Meet with school librarians and ask them to assist teachers in the identification of non-racist, non-sexist, multi-ethnic books and materials. Urge them to order and provide resources for supplementary materials.

Conduct a study and periodic review of the bias found in the textbooks and materials used in your classrooms/schools.

Call on district or state curriculum development specialists to provide guidelines, materials, training, and other resources related to non-racist, non-sexist books and materials.

Include provisions for in-service training and funds for supplementary materials in collective bargaining or teacher negotiations.

Organize a central file in your school or district of supplementary materials, curriculum outlines, or other resources you have used for identifying bias and supplementing the curriculum.

Develop a list of local resource persons, materials, and other resources for use in the classroom.

Identify non-traditional publishing firms, alternative presses, and other groups developing materials in this area. Make sure that information about these groups is distributed to all teachers.

Publicize studies, workshops, and other efforts to improve materials or reduce the impact of biased materials.

Administrators

Develop a policy statement outlining your concern about the elimination of racist and sexist stereotypes in textbooks and library books.

Appoint a task force to investigate the problem in your community and make recommendations for action.

Develop guidelines for all personnel to follow in purchasing and using textbooks and other instructional materials.

Earmark a proportion of funds to be used for the purchase of non-racist, non-sexist supplementary materials.

Develop and implement a plan for in-service training of all personnel who select, purchase, recommend, or use textbooks or other instructional materials.

Direct supervisors and curriculum developers to develop resources and materials for assisting classroom teachers in reducing the impact of biased materials.

Call on state departments of education, teacher training institutions, and professional associations to provide materials, workshops, and technical assistance.

Interpret the problems of biased textbooks and materials to parents, community groups, and policy making boards. Let them know of your concerns and how they may assist in solving the problem.

Parents and Community Groups

Read the textbooks and materials that your children are using and identify sources of bias where they exist.

Meet with your children's teachers and principals. Learn how the problem is being handled in your school.

Work with other parents or groups to raise their awareness of the problem of biased materials.

Meet with school board members to outline your concerns. Support expenditures for supplementary materials and in-service training for school personnel.

Sponsor a community workshop on bias in textbooks and instructional materials. Include information that will assist parents in pointing out stereotypes in television, magazines, and other materials found in the home.

Organize a study of the bias of textbooks used in your community schools. Publicize the results and make recommendations for change.

Establish a special collection of books in the school or public library which features non-racist, non-sexist, and multi-ethnic books.

Identify how textbooks are selected in your community. Write to and/or meet with persons responsible for textbook selection at local and state levels to voice your concerns, urging purchase of quality materials and inclusion of supplementary materials.

Write to textbook publishers and indicate your dissatisfaction with biased materials. Support examples of non-racist, non-sexist books that have been developed.

Recognize the efforts of teachers and administrators who are taking positive actions to deal with the problem.

Organize a task force or speakers bureau to meet with other groups to extend their understanding of the problem and actions that may be taken.

3. Sex Stereotyping in Educational Guidance

By Phyllis Zatlin Boring

Contemporary existentialist writers often depict life as a labyrinth. Each individual is constantly confronted by choices. Once he (or she) has chosen a certain path, he can never undo that decision. By choosing, he closes off options that might have been open to him. If he retraces his steps, he may get back to the place he previously bypassed. But time and circumstances will have changed.

The image of a labyrinth may well be applied to one's education. From the earliest grades on, education is a maze. The student must constantly choose paths. By choosing, he closes doors. By selecting a language, he may sacrifice a science. By taking a business course, he may close the door to college.

Confused by the labyrinth of choices, the student naturally turns to his teachers and his guidance counselors, hoping that they—like the mythological Ariadne—will give him a magic thread to find his way into and out of the maze. The responsibility that falls on educators is then great indeed, for, as we well know, there is no magic thread.

Even with good intentions and the advantage of our experience, our advice is not always flawless. The best that we can do is guide our students so that they will keep as many options as possible open as long as possible so they do not find themselves in a dead-end path.

The educational maze for the young woman has been, unfortunately, much simpler than for the young man. Many of the doors were already closed for her—by quota systems, legal and social barriers, overt discrimination. Our girls have been encouraged to prepare for careers in nursing, library service, social work, teaching, and secretarial work. They have been told by society, our legal structure, and our tax laws that their real role is marriage and motherhood.

I recently ran across the school newspaper from my ninth grade. Each of the graduating ninth graders of 1953 was asked his secret ambition. The one field most frequently mentioned was secretarial work. Twenty-four percent of the girls in my class gave this as their secret ambition. Some of them were quite precise about their interests: they wanted to work for a banker or lawyer or millionaire. (But they were not ambitious enough to see themselves in those roles, only as supportive to them.)

The second most popular field was nursing, chosen by 16 percent of the girls. By contrast the two most freqently mentioned fields among the boys were doctor and engineer, with 11 percent of the boys surveyed choosing each of those two fields. Fourteen girls in that class said that their secret ambition was to get married. One boy mentioned his future marital status—he wanted to be a doctor with a beautiful wife.

My class's secret ambition, viewed in retrospect, rather saddened me. At 13 or 14, young people should have ambitions that reflect a certain amount of imagination and idealism. Not many of us realize our youthful goals; we seldom *over*reach them.

Many a man who started out planning to be a brain surgeon has been a high school teacher instead. Many of the Spanish majors I advise at Rutgers started out in engineering. But the reverse is seldom true. The person who starts out in Spanish cannot easily switch to engineering. The person who has decided by ninth grade that she wants a secretarial career is not thinking of college. She has already discarded a good many options relative to her future education and employment.

In the past few years, women have been protesting that they are underutilized in many fields—particularly those that require the greatest training and pay the highest salaries. They have said they are disproportionately concentrated in the lowest paying, dead-end jobs.

"True," respond the critics, "but that is because women wanted nothing else. If women had wanted to be architects or pharmacists, dentists or engineers, there would be women in those fields."

Despite the great pressure that has been placed on women to stay out of science, social science, and the professions, there have been women interested in those fields. And there have been women who have survived in them. We do not lack feminine representation in traditional male fields. But, unfortunately, it has been an uphill battle for many of these women.

To go back to my ninth grade, I was most interested in finding that some of my classmates were nonconformists. Of the six students who wanted to be lawyers, two were girls. Two girls also wanted to be doctors. The only person in the class who wanted to be a veterinarian was a girl. One girl wanted to be a counterspy, one wanted to be an FBI agent. Another said she would be a rancher. Those girls may have been the minority, but they at least had not yet accepted sexual stereotyping.

As I look back, I find teachers and guidance counselors had an important role in the decisions that I made. My high school language teachers steered me into my present career by encouraging me to go on. My high school math teachers did not similarly encourage me. And thus my field was chosen.

I vividly recall an interview with the guidance counselor after taking a series of aptitude tests in tenth grade. She told me I had scored very high on the four tests taken into consideration in determining engineering aptitude. "But," she said, "I know that you don't want to be an engineer." At age 15, I nodded my head in agreement and did not think about it again for years.

Even the 97 percentile score that I received on the math aptitude test for my Graduate Record Exam—

despite the fact that I never got as far as calculus—did not give me pause. Now, I find that that little scene has great significance for me. It has been said that 40 percent of the people in this country who show an aptitude for engineering in tests are women, but only one percent of our engineers are women. Women are not engineers because they have been steered out of the field.

It may well be that my guidance counselor made the comment with the best of intentions. She undoubtedly knew, as I did not at the time, that many colleges of engineering did not admit women at all and that others required women applicants to be superior to men applicants for admission. She undoubtedly knew that if I managed to get into and through engineering school, despite the obstacle course, many companies would not hire me, and if they did, they would pay me a lower salary than men. She was probably giving realistic advice.

Being realistic, she may well have told my classmates who wanted to be lawyers to try another field instead. Law schools across the country have maintained rigid quota systems against women, not allowing the percentage in any given class to approach 10 percent. She perhaps told the same thing to the two girls who wanted to be doctors. And she would have been correct.

As for the girl who wanted to be an FBI agent, it was not until May 1972 that acting director Patrick Gray of the FBI indicated his willingness to hire women agents. J. Edgar Hoover had consistently barred women from the ranks.

If the girls in my class took vocational preference tests, that too might have helped them change their minds about offbeat careers like rancher or veterinarian. The widely used Strong Vocational Interest Test has two versions, one male and one female. Dr. Gloria Leon, a Rutgers University psychologist, recently analyzed the two tests with the following results:

"A comparison of the items in each section of the male and female versions of the Strong inventory reveals the pervasive influence that sex role stereotypes have on the differential vocational expectations for men and women. The sex role biases inherent in this test range from the subtle to the blatantly obvious.

"For example, it would be extremely difficult, on the basis of the Strong test results, to counsel a woman college student to choose a career in physics or engineering. The activity preferences the woman student is asked to rate are oriented around traditionally feminine choices, such as furnishing and caring for a new home, or choosing between a preference for fashion magazines or household magazines.

"Many of the item choices on the men's form are related to expectations of traditional male vocational behavior, such as 'develop the theory of operation of a new machine,' or 'supervise the manufacture of a machine.' Although the women's form of the Strong inventory does contain some items related to male dominated careers, the majority of choices are oriented toward subordinate vocational choices.

"In every section of the inventory, the career choices listed for men and women channel the women's responses into traditional and/or subordinate vocational interests. Whereas the males are asked to choose between 'travel to outer space' and 'explore bottom of ocean,' the women are asked to choose between 'be married to a rancher' and 'be married to a corporation president.' "

The girl in my class may have taken that test and realized that she should not want to be the rancher herself, but rather the wife of the rancher.

Opportunities for women have, indeed, been limited. Certain fields have systematically discriminated against women—and educators have advised women accordingly. The combination has helped to perpetuate sexual stereotyping in education and employment. It is not by accident that only three countries in the world have a lower percentage of women doctors than the United States: Spain, Madagascar, and South Vietnam. It is not by accident that we have a lower percentage of women lawyers than most European countries.

It is not by accident that women have been losing ground in many fields. A hundred years ago, one-third of the college teachers in the United States were women. Now, the figure is less than one-fifth. Fifty years ago most elementary school principals were women. Today, 80 percent of the elementary school principals are men.

In fact, women may well be doing worse in those very fields that they have considered their own. Eighty precent of librarians are women. But two-thirds of the head librarians of city and university libraries are men. Rutgers University is one of only two major university systems in the U.S. with a woman head librarian.

In field after field, women are concentrated in the bottom ranks and are paid less than men for doing the same work. In fact, according to government statistics, a woman has to have a college degree in order to earn as much as a man with an eighth-grade education.

Ten years ago sex discrimination was widespread and legal. Today it is widespread and illegal. While it used to be a fact of life, it need no longer be. The advice that was in the best interests of our young women a decade or two ago must now be changed. We must now encourage our women students to choose paths that were formerly closed to them.

For example, we are seeing a revolution in the law schools. The Rutgers Law School at Newark adopted a new admissions policy giving equal consideration to women applicants. The result the first year was a 1971 entering class that was 40 percent women. Other law schools are following suit. The legal profession is no longer closed to all but the most outstanding women.

The medical profession should soon be following the example of our law school, too. Since November 1971, with passage of the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act, schools of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and nursing can no longer qualify for federal funds if they discriminate in admissions on the basis of sex.

Although this law is not yet being effectively enforced and although some of the medical schools seem determined to fight it, women's rights groups are on the job to see that discriminatory quota systems are wiped out.

Guidance counselors, however, must also take an active role in bringing more women into the medical profession. Now, because only 10 percent of the applicants to some medical schools are women, these schools claim they are not to blame. It is up to counselors to break up this vicious cycle.

In the past few years, hundreds of colleges and universities holding federal contracts have been investigated by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on charges of sex discrimination. There is strong hope that academic women will soon no longer be concentrated in the bottom ranks of college teaching. Other fields that should be opening up to women because of new legislation will be government service and management.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act, signed by President Nixon in March 1972, extends the coverage of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and hence the jurisdiction of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to public employees, educators, and professional level people.

While there have in the past been virtually no women in top executive positions either in government or in private business, today the very companies that most actively excluded women from such positions in the past are now most under pressure to promote women.

A few years ago it was common practice to bar women from management trainee programs. Today such a practice is illegal. Any company that insists upon doing so is open to government investigation and court suits.

It is also true that employers may no longer force pregnant employees to quit their jobs. And new EEOC guidelines on sex discrimination indicate we soon may have paid maternity leaves.

Some headway is apparent also in the area of equal pay, at least among new hires. The average starting monthly pay offered to women college graduates differs only a few dollars from that of men in most fields. The only field in which there is still an appreciable gap is sales and marketing, where the men are offered $70 a month more.

It is extremely important that some previously male fields are opening up to women, particularly at a time when there may be diminished opportunities in teaching, the field which has absorbed up to the present the highest numbers of college-trained women. Labor Department projections indicate there will be good opportunities in law, the health professions, and business into the 1980's. But there may be serious problems for people seeking teaching positions.

A young woman interested in education would be well advised to think of special education, preschool education, college teaching, or school administration, rather than regular classroom teaching at the elementary school or high school level. Or she might plan, instead, for a career in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, or business, where there will still be good opportunities when she graduates. While schools of business administration very recently still discriminated against women applicants, they are now under pressure to actively recruit qualified women students.

Looking back, some of my ninth-grade classmates were thinking of marriage instead of a career. Our young women today must be told that not only is it possible to have both a career and marriage, but that most likely they will work whether or not they marry.

Moreover, demographers tell us that there are increasing numbers of women in their early 20's who are remaining single. Women today constitute almost 40 percent of the American work force—and more than 50 percent of the female population between the ages of 18 and 64 are working. While most career women 50 years ago were single—in part because employers frequently fired women if they married and certainly if they became pregnant—today the working woman is just as likely to be married.

More women are also combining motherhood and work. There are 18 million mothers working who have children under 18 years of age, and each year sees a greater number of women with preschool children entering the work force. Women no longer work until they catch a husband and then stay home. Typically they work for a few years before their children are born. They have fewer children than women did before, and their childbearing is over by the time they are 30. They tend to reenter the work force by the age of 35 and continue to work until retirement.

If a young woman knows that she is going to work for 30 or more years, she will realize that she must prepare for a challenging career—not simply settle for a temporary or dead-end job.

The more education a woman receives, the more likely she is to work. While only 17 percent of the women with less than an eighth grade education work outside the home, slightly more than half of the women with a college degree are in the work force at any given time. The figure rises to 71 percent of women with five years of college and 91 percent of women holding doctorates.

Educators must take active steps to encourage girls to follow their interests and abilities, not assume that because they are female they do not want to study math or science but would rather specialize in English or Spanish.

Look around you with a new awareness. Make sure your school understands its role in improving the status of women in our society. Check the vocational preference tests used at your school and make sure they do not have a sex bias and are interpreted fairly. Examine the textbooks used and see if they have a sexist orientation. If they do, write to the publisher and urge him to revise the material.

If problems stem from parental attitudes, perhaps your school can plan a special kind of career day program—including parents—which will stress the changing roles of women in our society.

Above all, let the young women whose lives you are helping to shape know that all fields are now open to them, that their choices are limited only by their own interests, talents, and motivation.

4. A Child's-Eye View of Sex Roles

By Lynne B. Iglitzin

In 1971 and 1972, two studies dealing with sex stereotyping were conducted on schoolchildren in three suburbs of Seattle. In the first study, 290 fifth graders (141 boys, 149 girls) took part; in the second study, 147 fifth graders (80 boys, 67 girls).

The first study (in which I collaborated with sociologist Judith Fiedler) involved a series of questions designed to show sex stereotyping based on views of career and employment patterns, social roles in home and family, and the child's view of his/her future life as an adult. Both boys and girls demonstrated sex stereotyping (as measured by the response "men" or "women" rather than "either" or "both" to the questions). However, significantly higher proportions of girls had nonstereotyped responses in all categories.

Career and employment patterns. We gave the children a list of jobs and asked them to indicate whether "men," "women," or "both men and women" should perform these tasks. A majority of both sexes thought that bosses, taxi drivers, mayors, factory workers, and lawyers should be men and that nurses and house cleaners should be women.

Stereotyping was common for both boys and girls. In fact, in some cases, girls were even less inclined than boys to see traditionally masculine jobs become feminine jobs. For example, 3.6 percent of the boys said mayors should be women, but only 2 percent of the girls said this. Although girls were as little inclined as boys to reverse sex roles in traditionally sex-tied jobs, girls were much more willing to see jobs open to either sex.

Home and family. The results for this part of the study showed that fifth graders have been thoroughly inculcated with a sex-typed view of home and household: Women wash dishes, cook, dust, scrub floors, and get up at night with a sick child. Men pay bills, fix things, and weed the yard. The men's list was shorter than the women's—even taking out the garbage was bestowed by our children on women! Girls' views were as traditional as boys', though the girls showed a slightly greater tendency to see both parents performing household tasks.

Personality traits. At least 60 percent of the girls saw themselves as kinder, better behaved, more serious, and better in math than boys; by a smaller majority the girls thought they "figured things out" better, too. The majority of girls saw boys as fighting more and as better in science. Children of both sexes tended to see most traits as distinctly masculine or feminine, though they did not always agree on which sex should be linked to a particular trait. The aggressive-gentleness continuum offered a striking example of agreement by both sexes: Close to 90 percent of boys and girls saw boys as fighting more, and about 75 percent of boys and 85 percent of girls saw girls as kinder.

Although the girls in the sample were traditional in their sex-typed view of some personality traits, more of them saw both sexes exhibiting these traits.

Sex typing in girls' view of their future. The pattern of traditional sex typing which emerged in girls' views of social roles and personality traits carried over into their career aspirations and descriptions of their lives as adults. While the boys wanted to be craftsmen, engineers or scientists, professionals (doctors, lawyers, dentists), sportsmen, and pilots, the girls wanted to be teachers, artists, stewardesses, nurses, and veterinarians.

Overall, the girls had varied job and career aspirations, albeit heavily weighted toward traditional female occupations. They seemed in little doubt that they would have careers. Only 6 percent said they would be simply a mother or a housewife.

Yet when we correlated the career-choice question with an open-ended essay, "Imagine you are grown up. Describe how you would spend a typical day," a different picture emerged. The girls showed a marked discrepancy between their stated career goals and their descriptions of an actual day.

Girls in the sample emphasized marriage and family much more than boys in the sample. Despite the small number (6 percent) who said they would be housewives and mothers, well over 25 percent of the girls (compared to 10 percent of the boys) made marriage and family the predominant focus of their projected day, and an even larger group (38 percent of the girls, compared to 14 percent of the boys) emphasized details of family life in their descriptions. In contrast, boys overwhelmingly ignored domestic life—well over 83 percent (compared to 63 percent of the girls) gave no details of family activities and fewer than one-fourth even mentioned marriage or family.

Typically, many of the girls commented extensively and in detail on housewifely routine. Even girls who had chosen a variety of careers in the earlier question saw themselves doing traditional "women's work" around the house. In fact, for many, the description of the household chores seemed far more salient than the job. A girl who had said she wanted to be "an artist, maybe a beautician" described her typical day as follows:

> I would start the morning after getting out of bed by eating breakfast. Then I would clean house. If I was done before lunch I would probably visit a friend. Then eat lunch. After lunch I would go shopping. Then I would come home and rest for a while. When my husband came home (if I was married) he would probably tell me how his day went and I would tell him how mine went. If he was in a real good mood he would take me out to dinner. When we were done with dinner we would go to a movie. Then we would go home and go to bed.

Boys tended much more to focus exclusively on details of job and career. The following statement by a boy who wants to be a lawyer and who never discusses marriage, family, or home was quite typical:

> I would talk to my clients on what their problems were. If I thought his thoughts were right I would explain the right procedures to take depending on his problems, and I would fight for his thoughts.

The comments of girls who said they wanted to be housewives could be described as typical of persons leading what has been called the "contingent life"—seeing one's actions as derived from and dependent on the wishes of others. Thus such statements as "I would try to please my husband" or "If my children wanted to" were common in their essays.

This study indicated that the degree of traditional sex stereotyping of the major social roles in society is very strong by the fifth grade level.

Of particular interest is the fact that so many of the girls clearly opted for career choices that they appear to be unwilling or unable to translate into consequences in their own lives.

What is the explanation for this dichotomy between career choice and visualization of future life that our data showed applied unequally to the boys and girls in our sample? It appears that social stereotypes restrict girls in expressing a free choice of future roles. If this is true, it may be that the first question, "What would you like to be when you grow up?" by suggesting that such decisions are possible, permitted the girls freedom to state their wildest wishes. The later question, however, brought them down to earth by asking them to imagine a typical day. The realities of societal pressure took over, they saw themselves doing things women always do, and thus fell back into the traditional activities society sanctions for women.

In our view, the most significant finding of all was that the girls were consistently less stereotyped in their views than the boys. This was a puzzling finding that we were at a loss to explain, particularly in view of the literature that attests to women as traditional bearers and upholders of conservative values.

One variable that seemed to be relevant in determining which children had less traditional sex-stereotyped attitudes was whether or not their mothers worked. As other studies have shown, our data indicated that children with working mothers—especially girls—had more liberal views on roles of men and women in society.

A year later, I decided to try a follow-up study in the same schools and with the same age children to determine what effect, if any, the strongly stereotyped views children hold have on their political attitudes and beliefs. More particularly, my interest was with girls, who had always emerged as less politically interested and aware than boys in previous socialization studies. I wondered whether a relationship exists between strong adherence to traditional feminine values and weak political interest among girls.

As in the 1971 study, the new questionnaire dealt with children's own view of their future roles in job and family; the degree of openness/stereotyping in their view of social roles for men and women; and, new in this study, a series of questions designed to explore their political information and awareness.

Sex differences and political responses. A number of questions attempted to deal with the degree of stereotyping in children's views of both public and private roles. I was curious to see if the sexual division of labor that we had seen extended into family and social roles also held true for the civil and political areas.

The democratic norm of equal opportunity implies that anyone can be President, a goal theoretically open to both sexes. Which was more salient for the girls, the rhetoric of equal access or the reality of male dominance in virtually all positions of political power? For boys, the log-cabin-to-Presidency myth or an impenetrable "power elite"? Do 11-year-olds find the prospect of becoming powerful political leaders someday attractive? What degree of realism do they have about their actual chances of attaining such posts?

To get answers to some of these queries, I asked a number of questions dealing with national and local politics. First, I asked the children to assume that they were adults and could choose any political job, such as President, governor, judge, head of the school board, and mayor. Strikingly, well over half of the children picked none of these posts. Strong sex differences were apparent in the answers of those who picked political jobs, however. Although about the same small proportion of boys and girls chose President, a sizable number of boys wanted to be mayor, yet not a single girl chose this. For girls, the popular choices were head of the school board and judge.

Then, I asked the children to assess which of the positions they thought they had a realistic chance of attaining. Here I wanted to find out if the girls, more than the boys, would sense the great difficulty of achieving these high prestige roles in our society. This pattern did not occur. Percentages were almost identical to the previous question.

Several interpretations are possible. Probably many of the children did not understand the concept of "realistic" and simply copied the answer they had given in the previous question. Or else, their political concepts are still so naïve that they truly think they can become anything they want to be. Or maybe their initial choices are already calibrated to what is possible: They sense the impossibility of the "you-too-can-be-President-someday" myth and refuse to play that game.

Other sex differences emerged that were in line with previous socialization studies. When asked to decide why they might vote for a candidate, girls were more likely to choose candidates who were peace-oriented and honest and sincere. Over twice as many boys as girls chose the candidate whose ideas would contribute to the country's economic wealth.

I drew up a composite index to include the determinants of political information and awareness. The information score consisted of correct answers to the various political identification questions; the awareness score was composed of any response other than "don't know" to the various questions dealing with voting and elections. On each of these scores, the girls did more poorly than the boys.

In areas beside the political, sex stereotyping was as strong in the attitudes of these children as it had been in their counterparts the year before. Girls saw themselves eventually marrying and having children; boys saw themselves as adults in terms of jobs. Over half the children thought only men should do certain jobs and only women, certain others. A very low 10.6 percent of the girls and 14.7 percent of the boys said a woman should work "anytime she wants to."

Stereotyping and politicalization. Once the existence of sex differences had been established, I attempted to see if a common variable, stereotyping, could be isolated as a determinant of low politicalization. The measurement of stereotyping was the degree to which the children saw social roles (housework, medical care, and so on) in the traditional terms of sexual dichotomy. For all the children, I matched the stereotyping index against the separate political information and awareness indices and, in addition, for girls, I matched the femininity index (measured by their adherence to traditional female careers and values) against the political scores.

Results were inconclusive. Stereotyping clearly exists, but the data did not show any strong relationship with level of political information and awareness except in a few cases at the extremes.

The main concern was to see the effect of stereotyping and feminizing influences upon the girls. Here girls did seem more strongly affected than did boys. There were some indications that girls who had the least narrowly feminine aspirations scored higher on political information and awareness, but the relationship was weak. Similarly, the occupation of the mother (housewife vs. job holder) clearly affected the girls' aspirations and degree of stereotyping but was less apparent in influencing their politicalization scores. In contrast to the earlier study, such a small percent of the mothers of these girls were job holders that it would be misleading to draw any conclusions based on the daughters of working mothers.

Summary. The expected strong sex differences on political, social, and economic roles in society emerged. Moreover, the existence of very strong sex typing in children's views of jobs and functions in the world, as well as their own personal role within it had been again confirmed. But the hoped for correlation between stereotyping and feminization in the girls as an explanation for their low politicalization scores proved inconclusive.

Why? Two explanations are possible. First, very few of the girls identified themselves in terms other than marriage and family; the sample failed to turn up more than a tiny handful of girls who had not been feminized. Therefore, comparisons weren't possible.

Second, perhaps the questionnaire reflects an unconscious ideology of sexism because of the sexist subject matter with which the questions concern themselves. (Before undertaking the study, I had attempted to control for sexist language. For example, I used "he/she" instead of the ubiquitous "he" and included women as examples of political leaders.) The subject matter of the questionnaire, as well as that of others dealing with this same subject, is male-oriented because political posts have historically always been occupied by men.

When politics is conceptualized in terms of power, aggression, and conflict, it is not surprising that women, trained in submissiveness, dependence, and passivity, should find little in it to interest them.

For too long, political scientists have focused only on the macro level of politics, dealing with formal power as exercised in institutions and by government officials. It is no wonder that children, and indeed many adults, feel alienated and removed from its concerns. Political scientists need to emphasize the micro level of politics—power hierarchies in family, peer groups, and classrooms. Undoubtedly, children can tell political scientists a great deal about this dimension of politics.

5. Sexual Politics in the Classroom

By Sheila Tobias

I became interested in sexual politics in the classroom while teaching the first course on women's studies at Cornell in 1970. I was struck then by the fact that sex-role socialization is viewed as taking place primarily in early childhood. What also struck me was the fact that most psychologists ignore the degree to which *adult* experiences reinforce that socialization. As we know, little girls are rewarded for docility, passivity, and dependence, while little boys are rewarded for assertiveness and independence, and such training carries over into behavioral characteristics of adults. Yet, experiences in the world of work, and in higher education, give enormous support to those views we have learned to accept earlier as "normal."

Sexual politics on the job is obvious. Examine any large organization, where it is easy to see the intense and almost perfect segregation of jobs by sex. Look at the jobs in a university and notice that in those categories occupied by women, there are almost no men. Clerical staffs are predominantly women. By contrast, in training programs for management, men predominate. Any observer must see that it is not by accident that, in the eyes of a corporation, female applicants only qualify for jobs that are "female" and men for jobs that are "male." A plausible explanation is that roles are played in an organization parallel to those in the family. "Mommy" has tasks that "Daddy" never does—and vice versa. Thus the notion is reinforced that what women do, men don't do.

Another phenomenon at work is what I call "satellitism," occurring when a male, admittedly higher in qualifications, is surrounded by females who assist him and reflect his "glory." Antidiscrimination laws are ineffective remedies because the females are less qualified than the male. Moreover, satellitism furthers the notion that men are superior to women. By contrast, somewhere in the organization there is an equally qualified female who could be surrounded by less qualified men, but as we know, this never occurs. Another aspect of adult role playing is that women are almost never put into authority over men. For those of you who have read Kate Millett's *Sexual Politics*, you will remember that she notes in Chapter Two that the conventional wisdom explains sex differences as follows: Women are born with certain behavioral characteristics which fit them for their adult roles. They are nurturant, dependent, nonaggressive. Then the roles they assume as wives and mothers divert them from the centers of power. The key advancement years in vocations and politics are from 25 to 35, but these are precisely the years when women are outside the profession. Every university or school system wants a young president or superintendent with 15 years experience post Ph.D., and this effectively excludes mothers who have taken 5 to 10 years off.

Millett has taken the scheme whereby temperament leads to role and role leads to status and turned it on its head. She hypothesizes that since men wish to remain superior in power and status, they assign women to roles that will keep them from competing with them. The role of mother keeps them in the home; the role of wife keeps them primarily in a support position relative to a man's career. And, in order to keep them from rebelling, she further hypothesizes, men persuade women that they have temperamental characteristics that unfit them for anything else. The female, as Matina Horner says, is in a double bind: if she shows these characteristics that are regarded by professionals as competent, she is doomed to be called unfeminine; if she shows feminine characteristics she will not be successful.

Male and female children are affected by sex stereo-typing long before they reach college. At the elementary level girls are rewarded for neatness, docility, obedience, passivity, and following instructions both inside and outside of school. Thus, they experience little dissonance. Meanwhile boys are rewarded outside of school for the opposite kinds of behavior, which results in considerable conflict for the elementary school boy. Females outdistance males in grade-point averages in elementary school and through high school, but grades still reflect docility, obedience, and the special ability to produce what the teacher wants.

In college an opposite reward system begins to take place as the professors give recognition to intellectual aggressiveness, to ideas that are new, different, provocative, and challenging. This is the kind of behavior, though disobedient in a sense, that is reinforced in the world outside the classroom as male, and is rewarded on the job as well. You know the cliches: This young man has ideas. He thinks for himself. At this point it is the female who experiences conflict, for her docility is not rewarded in college as it was in the past. Moreover, when she does manifest behavior that is recognized as original and brilliant, she runs the risk of being considered bizarre.

Women are conditioned to avoid conflict, and if true to their sex role, they must be pacifiers. To the female intellectual or professional, this presents almost as serious a drawback as outright discrimination. Women will not get anywhere if they cannot think for themselves, if they are not aggressive about their interests, and if they are not willing to engage in intellectual conflict.

One obvious corrective to this situation is the teacher who will bend over backwards to challenge good intellects into nonsex-stereotyped behavior. Another corrective is the college teacher who learns to identify with women students. As teachers of women, men must conquer their beliefs that women are so different from them, and women teachers who are misogynists need to be confronted with their own biases.

Still another corrective measure that would help women succeed in college and in the profession would be an affirmative action program on the part of the university to hire more women as faculty members and as high level administrators. Women are needed as role models in such positions. Not only would female students benefit from such action, but also male students who need to encounter women in positions of authority.

The curriculum also socializes college students, and unless corrections are made, will continue to reinforce traditional sex roles and sex differences. Women's studies can provide a fundamental critique of the inherent sexism in the traditional curriculum, but unless compensation is made for earlier omissions of factual material concerning women throughout the broad range of disciplines, women will continue to be ignored and repressed. Notable among the disciplines requiring such curriculum revision are history, literature, psychology, and the social sciences.

One other area in which universities reinforce sex-typed preferences is one so familiar to you that I will not dwell on it, and that is the area of sex-typed fields of specialization. To give you an idea of how the assumptions that certain fields are masculine and others feminine become self-fulfilling prophecies, here are some statistics of earned doctorates in America from 1960 to 1968: 11 percent of the doctorates in all the natural sciences went to women; 30 percent of the doctorates in education went to women; 20 to 25 percent of the doctorates in social sciences went to women; and 30 percent of the doctorates in the humanities went to women.

The final area of adult socialization of college students is what I call the "wider world," and it is one for which we cannot hold the university entirely responsible. Nevertheless, I would demand of the university that it experiment with nonsexist ideology and hiring policies. I would ask that the university stand before the world as an example of how an institution can function in an egalitarian fashion. It should be the place where innovations in the curriculum are tried. It should be the first institution to initiate part-time full-status work for women professionals as well as the first to initiate child care as a regular part of the benefit structure.

Though more women go to college than ever before, we are not getting out of them the kind of professional commitment that earlier generations produced, because their upward mobility is blocked by sexual politics in the classroom, on the job, and in our society. Although 80 to 90 percent of women with doctorates work full-time, few are college presidents. Only three women have ever been state governors, and two have been senators. Recently a greater number of women have held seats in the House. Opportunities must be opened and women educated for the opportunities.

6. School Athletics and Sex Discrimination

By Kathryn F. Clarenbach

Of all the aspects of American life in which women are shortchanged, none is more glaring or more damaging than the area of physical development. In the prestigious world of American sports women are not even second-class citizens. My thesis is that our culture has systematically underdeveloped the physical prowess and skills of females, and that the effects of this underdevelopment are serious and many-faceted. I further believe that the failure of the wider society to permit women full human status—the right to be mature, responsible adults—is well illustrated through this microcosm.

Women are denied the opportunity for healthful, exciting self-expression through physical activity in many ways. From the moment of birth, infant girls are handled more gently than infant boys. Through nursery school days, girls are told and expected to stay clean and neat, not be noisy, play with dolls and dishes instead of trucks and footballs, and follow instructions. Snowballing, tree-climbing, and just goofing around in innumerable independent, unstructured physical play activities are reserved for boys, and little girls are being carefully and irrevocably programmed to be "young ladies."

By elementary school the plot really begins to thicken. The school system begins to groom the boys for the all-important star-studded teams of high school, college, and professional days ahead.

"Coaches" suddenly appear for third grade boys, and the disparity between budget, facilities, space, and equipment for boys and girls begins. We are so accustomed to huge expenditures for all-male athletic teams that it never occurs to us that this is an injustice that we endorse and help perpetuate. Just as our schools help create dependent women by denying them training in the very useful areas of shop and auto mechanics and by giving them limited if any professional aspirations, so they contribute to dependence and acceptance of second-class status in their total athletic programs.

Let's take a little closer look at what does happen to girls in our grade and high school physical education programs. Maybe, if they're lucky, the girls can use the quarter-of-a-million dollar gym one lunch period a week. If scheduled a full year in advance *maybe* they can have one Saturday Play Day a year with girls from another school—provided of course they abide by the state rules and have no publicity, no spectators, and no prizes or awards.

What happens in the physical education classes for girls? Whoever prepared the manuals or decided on course content must be someone who never was a kid and who has taken a sacred oath against having fun. My two daughters and their friends have been graded on the number of showers they take, whether they remember to have their gym suits laundered and tennies whitened each month, how many seconds they can hang by their arms on wall bars, and how fast they run sixty yards and get dressed afterwards. Both my girls are strong swimmers, excellent water and snow skiers, skillful at ping pong, good at bowling and tennis; neither one of them has ever had *one minute* of these activities in phys ed, except for an elective quarter in college. They were taught the rules of soccer from A to Z, but have never encountered a soccer game since leaving sixth grade.

The overemphasis on protecting girls from strain or injury and underemphasis on developing skills and experiencing teamwork fits neatly into the pattern of the second sex. Even so, girls are usually at least not subjected to some of the machismo-oriented, pseudomilitary regimens which often permeate boys' athletics. Our son's third-grade "coach" was a former marine whose favorite punishment for these eight-year-old boys was to send them through the mill. When our David refused to hit his friends, already demeaned by having to crawl on hands and knees between the legs of their classmates, he himself was punished for this "insubordination" with the same fate.

Later, in junior high, it was his misfortune to have the same coach, who was on the familiar (and for-men-only) coach to counselor to principal route. Our whole family was wearing "End the War" buttons; when David was called to be timed for the 100 yard dash, the coach snarled: "OK, Clarenbach, let's see how fast you can run out of Vietnam." What little heart Dave had for the race was gone with such public ridicule, and he ran badly.

I don't claim that the military mentality prevails universally in boys' athletics. I do believe there is far too much emphasis on the development of this and certain other so-called "masculine" qualities and values which are already too dominant in our society. Winning is all, and if it involves brutality, hostility, cruelty, permanent injuries, lack of compassion, unethical sly practices, so be it. It is incredible that our nation could accord the same national mourning for a beloved coach that it does for a head of state. I would far prefer that women did nothing more than tatting or quilting than be encouraged to emulate these aspects of the masculine mystique.

Meanwhile, girls are the spectators and the cheerleaders. They organize the pep clubs, sell pompoms, make cute abbreviated costumes, strut a bit between halves, and idolize the current football hero. Perfect preparation for the adult role of women—to stand decoratively on the sidelines of history and cheer on the men who make decisions, to be the nurse to the doctor, hygienist to the dentist, secretary to the boss, to live vicariously through father, husband, or son, to do the fund raising and circulate petitions for the men who run for office and fill executive posts. It only puzzles me that some enterprising coach hasn't enlisted willing young women to replace waterboys and towel wielders.

I shall long remember the 1968 Olympics in Mexico when several contestants in women's events were subjected to chromosome tests to verify their sex. One could only conclude that *women* were not expected to perform that well. Certainly American women are excluded as far as possible from many events even when they qualify (witness the jockeys and umpires). Apparently prestige or income—maybe both—are jeopardized in men's eyes with the invasion of women. If a woman can to it well, it must not be such a trick after all. This undervaluing of women and whatever they do also keeps women out of commercial piloting and virtually out of medicine, science, laws, politics, and engineering. By opening up the highly visible arena of sports and athletics to women, we may help of demolish the fears and the patterns of discrimination so prevalent elsewhere.

When women do succeed in tennis, golf, skating, diving, swimming, the rewards are rarely those of their male counterpart. Even *Sports Illustrated* noted the unjust inequities in tournament purses for men and women. Who ever heard of a female athlete in any event earning a six-digit salary? In fact, the only way a woman can qualify for the added thousands our athletes reap doing TV commercials is to be mistaken for her shapely teen-age daughter.

Even within the same college or high school, the incomes of men and women phys ed instructors tend to have considerable disparity. In those states that permit interscholastic sports for girls, their teams are coached by men. These are the same patterns that exist throughout our entire economy, where 75 percent of the 30 million employed women are in low-paid, dead-end occupations; twice as many women as men live in poverty; the largest group of unemployed are girls 16-22; and women and their children comprise 80 percent of our welfare rolls.

These are the results of an educational system which does not develop independence and skills in women and which teaches women that it is unfeminine to achieve or to demand equal opportunity.

7. Roles, Labels, Stereotypes: A Counselor's Challenge

By Barbara Cook

How can a counselor most effectively work with men and women students in helping them find individual identities—sometimes in contradiction of the roles dictated by society?

- What should it mean to the counselor to have an increased awareness of culturally defined roles for men and women?
- How may a counselor increase her or his own awareness?
- How does the counselor's self-concept affect his or her ability to help individual men and women find answers to their individual problems?

A recent survey done at my own institution shows that out of a faculty of 1,429, only 175 are women; 42 percent of our instructors are women; 14 percent of our assistant professors are women; 6.5 percent of our associate professors are women; and 3 percent of our full professors are women—an appalling significant decrease as the ranks become higher. We have six department heads who are women—all in the fields of home economics, nursing, and physical education for women. These are actual figures even though our student population is one-third female.[1]

The national figures show that it takes a female associate professor three times as long on the average to be promoted as it does a male associate professor. Such figures are familiar, so I will concentrate on the methods, techniques, and education necessary to prevent their continued occurrence. I quote them only as one small example of the enormous job yet to be done, the wasted talent, the undeveloped aspiration, and the way the humanness of both men and women is damaged in our society by sexual stereotyping.

There is no doubt that discriminatory policies as they affect women are receiving a good bit of attention nowadays. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has published guidelines for educational institutions and is insisting upon "positive, affirmative action" to the fair employment of women in terms of representative numbers, opportunities, and salaries. Women's organizations, concerned with all facets of women's lives, are proliferating and are beginning to take some affirmative action themselves. Perhaps the most significant quality, however, of most of the women's movements is "that most women's organizations are refusing to make the self-defeating mistake of earlier feminist movements—which focused on the uniqueness of women. More wisely the new women are declaring that they are human beings, equally so with men, and they promise emancipation from stereotyping for both sexes." [2]

In some of the recent literature, both scholarly and militant, the idea of the caste-like status of women and blacks has been given new attention. Helen Hacker first wrote about this in 1951.[3] Her model has been expanded and used by a number of writers to show the conscious or unconscious "rationalization of status"—the ascribed attitudes, the social visibility, the accommodation attitudes, the discriminations. A strong cultural prescription of roles dictates appropriate behavior not only for women and blacks, but also for men, for whites, and even for age groups—most notably the young. This prescription of roles is currently under attack by militant and/or concerned groups. This battle was waged first by the blacks through their acts of civil disobedience in Montgomery, then by the young with their insistence on "participatory democracy"—a giving to ordinary people of a real voice in the decision-making process. Now, finally, women are fighting on many fronts for legal equality as well as for free choice in the self-determination of their individual lives.

All three of these recent movements, occurring in increased strength since 1955, are speaking to the same principle—one that is at the very foundation of the education profession: the right of each individual to attain maximum development. (I am amazed daily that the precepts that student personnel workers have been endorsing since the 1920's have now become so much a part of the liberal-radical movements in educational reform. The real tragedy is that most of us don't even recognize them.) But a new and important dimension has been added to this fundamental concept: the right of each individual to attain maximum development according to his or her abilities, desires, efforts, and aspirations, *not* according to a social or sexual role prescribed by society.

As counselors, we must clearly understand what Robert Blackburn describes as "The Moral Revolution" in the November 1970 *AAHE College and University Bulletin.* Blackburn delineates eight new values, six of which are directly related to our subject:[4]

1. *Truth has a higher value than loyalty.*
2. *The individual is more respected than the organization.*
3. *Human needs have priority over technological concerns.*
4. *Personal expression is more important than social forms.*
5. *Openness is replacing secrecy.*
6. *No longer can a minority group be relegated to second-class citizenship.*

In summary, we are moving toward a society where truth, individualism, human needs, personal expression, openness, and real opportunity for all will be highly valued.

The Grafton Youth Report, a Madison Avenue publication geared to communications, business, and educational executives, talks squarely and sensibly to its subscribers. Its 1969 special report *A Set of Guidelines Dealing with Youth* offered the following suggestion:

> Remember that the sexes are integrated. Boys and girls today debate as equals, go out campaigning together for their favorite candidates, consult each other without affectation on their common problems. It does not occur to them that females should be addressed in any special way, or spared any knowledge about life. Much has been said about a "sex revolution," but the most important point seems to have been missed: *The two sexes are friends as they have never been before.* Any hint in choice of words or tone of voice that you are putting the female sex down in some way, as not quite the full partners of the male, will date you irrevocably and cause loss of confidence in what you have to say or sell.[5]

The November 1970 issue of that same Grafton report stated that women's liberation is the only youth movement today of any consequence (in both high schools and colleges) identifiable in all sections of the country.[6]

With this background of widespread public awareness of both racial and sexual discrimination, with the emphasis on attacking the societal prescription of roles for all people, and with the real interest being shown by youth in this problem (or at least in the problem of individualization), the counselor and the educator are in unique positions to help release the currents of change and to work more effectively with individuals—both boys and girls, whites and blacks—in offering individualistic alternatives for each person's life-style.

But alternatives for planning or action are only viable if they are realistic choices. Our society has not yet accepted the moral revolution of which Blackburn wrote, nor are all avenues open to all people. Nor are all counselors convinced that the wave of the near future will really allow the kind of individualism discussed here. Our own experience, biases, beliefs—our own historic sense and perceptions—too often show through clearly, if not always brightly. Yet when we work with students we work with the future. Our lockstep system of education too often decides the fate of a potential scientist by assignment of specific courses in the early years of high school. Talent and choice may too often be constrained in a counseling office when engineering is recommended for a bright boy, elementary education for a bright girl. And what of the kids who don't go to college? Elizabeth Koontz, director of the Women's Bureau, tells about the typical young *woman* who acquires some skill in typing. She may earn $2.50 an hour in some sections, or she may earn $1.65 an hour in other sections, to sit at her desk and type, type, type. **But** the *man* who repairs her typewriter earns $8.50 an hour. Sometimes, as counselors, we unwittingly help turn the keys that lock our students into prescribed roles without really giving enough thought to what their world may be like in 10 or 15 years.

Since World War II, sex roles for women have changed drastically. All good women counselors, and happily even some of the men, now know about life planning for women. Many of us can, at the drop of a hat, rattle off the latest Women's Bureau figures about the number of women in the labor force, the woman's age when her last child will be born, the number of years she will work correlated with educational attainment, and so forth. Woman has become *the* subject.

However, comparatively little has been written about the role of the male. There has been concern expressed in the field of education about female dominance in the training of the young, particularly that young boys are not being provided with any meaningful male figures. Some have protested that our society is female dominated, that men in this country grow up to be weak and dependent. Unfortunately much of the literature about male roles resolves these problems by suggesting ways to further emphasize and strengthen the "maleness" stereotype in our society, an emphasis that results inevitably in an "either/or" domination of one sex by the other. The truth is that children, all children, need meaningful male and female role models, role models who are significant human beings in their own right—neither dominated nor domineering. All writers agree, though, that the adult male seeks and finds his identity primarily through his work and secondarily through his family. For the woman, of course, it is the other way around.

However, emerging trends may have a direct relationship to changing sex roles, and we should be aware of these as well. Population control and the ecological balance have become a major source of concern. Kingsley Davis and others have hypothesized that, "given the assumption that population growth in the U.S. should be stopped by reducing the birth rate, efforts should be made to de-emphasize the women's role upon the importance of having children."[7] Since most studies have shown that the concept of the woman's role includes her having and rearing children, and that no matter what career she follows, her most important role is still that of becoming a mother, a serious movement toward population control will necessitate a change in this rather basic and culturally prescribed concept.[8] If anyone thinks that de-emphasizing the centrality of a woman's being a mother and a wife will be easy, I urge the reading of Billy Graham's article in the December 1970 *Ladies' Home Journal*. The Reverend Mr. Graham, backed by appropriate Bible texts, writes that Eve's *biological* role was to bear children; her *romantic* role was to love her husband; and her *vocational* role was to be second in command. He says:

> I believe the women's liberation movement is an echo of our overall philosophy of permissiveness. Everyone young, old, male and female seems bent upon abandoning any moral, Biblical and traditional guidelines. Many women are obviously saying, "Why can't we get in on the act?"[9]

Perhaps in the year 1990, when it is estimated that women will account for 55 percent of the U.S. population (as opposed to 51 percent now), Mr. Graham will be advocating polygamy so that all women can experience the fulfillment of following Eve's prescribed role as the bearer of children.

There are other changes of which we should be aware: the breakdown in traditional concepts of the nuclear family, increasing interest in communal and experimental living forms, and the new California divorce laws which share responsibility and financial arrangements equally between the two marriage partners and which promise to serve as models for other states. All these factors will tend to diminish the security of marriage for the male as well as for the female. Marriage in 1980 or 1985 is very likely to be something quite different from the father and mother held together by the rearing of the young. As this historical family concept continues to change, prescribed sex roles will become much more individualistic.

Counselors need to know both the present reality and the direction of the future if they are to help young people more easily enter a world filled with ever-increasing change and ambiguity. Alice Rossi challenged all counselors when she wrote:

> Hence, it is when men question work, and women question family commitment, and both sexes question an uncritical commitment to nation-state, that we find responses among parents, teachers, employers, and government officials ranging from a shiver of distaste to a convulsion of hate. The strange thing is that one hardly ever hears anyone point to precisely these emerging qualities among young people as healthy indicators that promise solutions to precisely the problems all would agree are reaching crisis proportions in the world at large. Virulent nationalism and the consequence of international hostility will not be solved by upping nuclear deterrence but by the emergence of supra-national loyalties to the well being of all men and women on earth. The population explosion will not be solved unless more men and women remain unmarried, have fewer children, or none at all. Environmental pollution will not be solved unless we live simply

> and stop as a nation from consuming more than half the world's raw materials. The technitronic future of increased leisure time will be meaningless unless men and women value that leisure time at least equally as much as their work time.[10]

Second, we must somehow develop a personal objectivity as we look at human needs. Many counselors internalize society's prescribed roles and are comfortable with them. Many professional men and women simply shrug and say "women's liberation doesn't concern me." Many, both men and women, feel threatened by a movement—a moral revolution, if you will—that may upset their security. There are others, unfortunately mostly women, who have been badly treated in their professional life—they have been denied opportunity because of their sex, not because of a lack of talent. They are not promoted or compensated as well, or as quickly, as their male counterparts. They find themselves increasingly uninvolved in significant work. The result of this frustration, as we know from the black movement, is often bitterness and militancy, or self-acceptance of a meaningless life and a concept of one's self as an unperson.

Third, we must fight discrimination on all levels within our own institutions. All of us can think of many examples of such discrimination in our own policies and procedures. At Purdue, for example, a reduction in our activity fee is given to spouses of male students but not to spouses of female students. At many institutions the salary paid is greater for married faculty with families than it is for the single faculty member. Nepotism bans continue in many schools. These are just a few of many stupid, inhuman practices left over from an earlier time. They must cease.

Fourth, we must provide good role models of both sexes—and all races, married and single—for our students. A young man should have as much opportunity to learn about being a male nurse as a young woman has about being a female doctor. We must somehow destroy the occupational myths of maleness and femaleness.

Again, we may learn from the black movement. Just as *Little Black Sambo* has been attacked because of the stereotyping of a black child, so we should attack children's books that exclusively show Mary *playing* house and Johnny *building* a house. Images of appropriate occupations by sex start quite young in a child's life and probably have hurt the young boy even more than the young girl. Because our culture is still male dominated, it is more acceptable for a girl to be a "tomboy" than for a boy to be a "sissy." Although it is not easy for either, it is probably easier for a woman to survive a college engineering course than for a man to survive a college home economics course. We can do some simple but tangible things here. We can examine our institutional literature and make sure pictures of students or faculty show a fair mixture of the sexes in all fields. We can also purge our vocational files of other examples of occupational stereotyping.

Fifth, professional women especially, paving the way for other women, must be more aggressive in defending and expanding their own status. Women must learn to avoid acting in stereotyped kinds of ways: women must learn to act, not only to react; women must learn to take initiative, to speak out, to assume more responsibility as professional people. Myths concerning women as weak, defenseless, and dependent must be destroyed, and women themselves must be willing to fight this battle.

Last, we must simply be good human persons ourselves. Strangely, when I am shaken out of my accustomed nondirective role and allow myself to show frustration, anger, or joy, I reach students a great deal more effectively. They care about seeing us as we are; we must have enough self-confidence to share ourselves with them—not always as a woman, not always as a counselor or a dean, but some of the time just as a normal person reacting with, and to, them the same way.

Ashley Montagu makes my point in a very few sentences:

> Every person embodies an adventure of existence, and the art of life consists in the guidance of this adventure, an adventure in which men and wom-

en must participate equally. The prime business of a democracy, the great democratic task of men and women, is not the making of things, not even the making of money, but the making of human beings. . . .[11]

FOOTNOTES

1. Purdue University, Breakdown of Faculty by Rank and Sex, October 1970.
2. Owens, Louise H. "Toward More Meaningful Counseling with Women." Paper presented at the American Guidance and Personnel Association, March 1970.
3. Hacker, Helen M. "Women as a Minority Group." *Social Forces* 30: 60-69; 1951.
4. Blackburn, Robert T. "Changes in Faculty Life Styles." *AAHE College and University Bulletin*, November 1, 1970.
5. Grafton Report. *Youth Report: A Set of Guidelines for Dealing with Youth.* New York: Grafton Publications, 1969.
6. Grafton Report, November 1970.
7. Davis, Kingsley. "Population Policy: Will Current Programs Succeed?" *Science*, November 1967. p. 158.
8. Slolka, Susan, and Barnett, Larry D. "Education and Religion as Factors in Women's Attitudes Motivating Childbearing." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 31: 740-50; November 1969.
9. Graham, Billy. "Jesus and the Liberated Woman." *Ladies' Home Journal*, December 1970. pp. 42, 44.
10. Rossi, Alice S. "Women in the Seventies: Problems and Possibilities." *Barnard Alumnae*, Spring 1970, p. 7.
11. Montagu, Ashley. *The Natural Superiority of Women.* New York: Lancer Books, 1953. p. 177.

8. Alternatives to a Sexist Curriculum

By *Rose M. Somerville*

What brought about a demand for women's studies courses in this country in recent years? Several prior movements helped to create the demand.

Certainly the civil rights movement showed young people in general—not just ethnic minorities—how to press for social change. At the same time, it convinced young women who were active in the movement that male leadership was placing them in subordinate positions and keeping them there. Unable to effect changes within male-dominated organizations, they became resentful and as a result formed women's caucuses at national conventions of civil rights groups—a practice that soon spread to professional organizations.

By the late 1960's a wide spectrum of women, mainly young, on campuses and off, were meeting in small intimate groups and rapping about their personal and professional experiences. Some of these rap groups moved into social action to make their grievances known. The mass media sensationalized much of what was happening, and "Women's Lib" became a household phrase connoting irrational demands rather than a painstaking search for answers to injustice.

College campuses, fortunately, afforded greater opportunity for dialogue that could illuminate the diversity of views among women's liberation adherents. Female faculty members and graduate students began zealously examining their status and airing their discontents. Campus perpetuation of stereotypes highlighted the need for new courses.

Demands for the introduction of Black and Chicano studies set a precedent for moving ahead despite administrative and academic uncertainties and eased the path for introduction of women's studies—a curriculum expansion that will undoubtedly be felt in high schools and elementary schools.

Textbooks and other children's literature as well as radio and TV programs are under examination in various states by both voluntary and official committees, spurred on by feminist criticisms of the traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity that permeate both writings and illustrations. (For example, a bill before the California legislature would require that texts used in the public elementary and secondary schools include "accurate portrayals of both men and women in all types of roles, including professional, vocational, and executive.") As a result, teachers will undoubtedly have more appropriate teaching materials and more motivation to offer students a broader conception of male and female roles—from kindergartners' show-and-tell to term projects in college, from seating arrangements to career stories.

On many campuses, student initiative brought women's studies into existence. Faculty support, pressure from women's caucuses of professional organizations, and the general demand for relevance all speeded up establishment of women's studies. But the strength of students' demands and their untiring efforts to convince hesitant faculties and administrators were the outstanding factors.

Deciding which courses now being offered are "women's studies" is not always easy. Courses in the past rarely focused exclusively on women, but many extensively considered the roles of women both here and abroad. Sociology of the Family, widely offered in American colleges in the past two decades, is one example. It might be said that women's studies in various colleges both built on past curriculum offerings and stimulated greater focus on women in many courses not formally designated as part of a women's studies program.

By the fall of 1970, San Diego State had set up within the College of Arts and Letters a formal Women's Studies Program. In addition, various departments continue to offer traditional courses in which women's images, needs, and activities have constituted an important aspect of study, such as Human Sexuality, Family Interaction, Contemporary British Literature, and World Drama. Further courses have been redesigned to emphasize the role, status, and potential of women.

When colleges try to set up formal programs of women's studies, they often face problems of funding and administration. These include the creation of new faculty positions, the lack of tenure in some instances on the part of those most interested in heading up a new department, institute, or center, and the relationship of the new administrative unit to the previous system of majors, credits, and credentialing. As a result, even where an institution offers a large number of new courses, as at Cornell University, they may be scattered in many departments. What united these dispersed courses at Cornell in 1970-71 (Evolution of the Female Personality: History and Prospects; Women in Education; the Representation of Women in Literature; Women and Society; the Sociology of the Female Labor Force) was the spirit of Cornell's Female Studies Steering Committee rather than its formal status in the University.

In contrast, the program of women's studies at San Diego State had two-and-a-half faculty positions allocated to it in its first year, 1970-71, enabling it to offer 10 courses each semester: Socialization Process of Women, Self-Actualization of Women, Contemporary Issues in Women's Liberation (two sections), Women in History, Women in Literature (Part I on women characters and Part II on women writers), Human Sexuality, Status of Women in Various Economic Systems, and Women and Education. The same allocation for 1971-72 permits 10 courses to be offered again, with some changes in titling and content.

Most colleges and universities that do have women's studies offer a single course, or at most two, rather than a whole program. The list of courses on women for 1970-71 compiled by the Commission on the Status of Women of the Modern Language Association makes this point evident. Several departments offer the 66 courses included on the list, although English departments predominate. While the reading materials overlap to some extent, the variety of course design is most notable.

Some of the course outlines manage to convey the teacher's own sense of adventure in designing the new course. The same is true of some course titles: Woman as Hero, Daughters and Ducats, Sex and Politics, Feminine Personality, Linguistic Behavior of Male and Female.

Expansion of curriculum to allow a special focus on women's roles has brought with it a number of questions. One of these is whether or not men should be involved in women's studies. Some of the women who teach the courses and a number of the women students admit to feelings of frustration in having coeducational classes.

On the San Diego State College campus, these comments were heard: "You have to start so far back with the men. They are at points A and B while some of us who have been meeting in rap groups are much farther along in our reading and thinking. . . . Our education is intended to lead to action. Few men could be counted on to serve as activists for women's rights. . . . Some of the men enroll for amusement, to scoff, rather than for serious educational purposes."

There seems to be a positive correlation between a program's commitment to action and a desire on the part of its female participants to exclude males. However, even within the radical wing we find many divergent attitudes, ranging from a willingness to work closely with men to a view of man as the enemy from whom power must be wrested.

Another unresolved issue in women's studies is whether the courses should be taught from a feminist point of view, and, if so, can men teach them? The definition of a feminist point of view may be difficult to arrive at, but it probably would include these assumptions: (a) Society tends to curtail women's opportunities for growth beyond the limits set by biology. (b) Stereotypes and myths about woman hinder her advancement. (c) Male-dominated historiography, social research, and literary criticism continue markedly to resist recognizing female contributions and talents as does academia in general. (d) Women have internalized negative appraisals of their sex, and this internalization leaves many with a poor self-image and a reservoir of rage, as well as lowered aspirations.

Feminists are likely to believe that the male cannot be as sensitive and perceptive as the female in examining the social forces and the literary and historical reflections of these forces that, through the centuries, have put women down.

Some women's studies courses proceed on this assumption and reveal the viewpoint in such titles as Exploring the New Feminism: A Feminist Analysis of Our Culture. Others set as their goals "to see to what extent women's criticisms are justified and to consider whether the presence of such chauvinism (if it does exist) does or should affect our final evaluation of the [literary] work." Still others seek to find out "how would one go about proving or disproving these assumptions concerning women."

Some women's studies programs, such as the one at San Diego State, seek only teachers who have both academic credentials and involvement in women's causes off campus. Others stress academic qualifications only.

Although women now teach most women's studies courses in coeducational institutions, it seems that men teach the majority of such courses offered at several women's colleges. What actually happens when men rather than women teach? Does this hamper the consciousness raising that is a side effect of women's studies? A feminist might look at the outline of a course taught by a male, note his characterization of Mary Wollstonecraft's famous essay as "the first significant outburst by an Englishwoman," and demand to know whether he would dub John Stuart Mill's essay an outburst.

What is the future of women's studies courses and programs? Certainly, initial misgivings about them have diminished greatly. New research has been generated, and in the 1970's we can expect to see master's and doctoral dissertations that "search for the lost sex" in historical documents, government statistics, anthropological studies, works of art, and theoretical assumptions. These will enrich the course materials available.

Publishers have been hastening to meet the demand of women's studies courses with reissues of classics and numerous anthologies bringing together conveniently the articles on women that have appeared in women's liberation as well as professional journals. Hundreds of extension programs throughout the United States are now showing an interest in women's roles. Universities (through continuing education for women and agricultural extension programs) and state and local family-relations organizations have encouraged workshops, daylong institutes, exhibits, and related activities that focus on women's changing roles.

These developments are likely to encourage more colleges to offer women's studies. As yet no college has instituted a major in this field. Even the most developed program (in size if not in innovative course design and teaching techniques), that at San Diego State College, offers its 10 courses as electives that satisfy requirements in a number of fields. Moreover, there are still problems of articulation among courses, and sequence is largely a matter of chance.

Graduate courses are yet to come, although a breakthrough is evident in the one-year, action-oriented M.A. program in radical feminist studies at the Cambridge-Goddard Graduate School of Social Change (a branch of Vermont's Goddard College, located in Cambridge, Massachusetts). Seminars this year will include feminist history, cross-cultural studies of women, socialization to sex roles, women and the media, women and the law, feminist psychology. Additional topics will be added as demanded.

Almost certainly, from now on, U.S. campuses will have to abandon their original tendencies to offer relatively little on women's roles. We can hardly expect, however, any easy resolution of the issues still in question.

9. Images of Males and Females in Elementary School Textbooks in Five Subject Areas

By Lenore J. Weitzman and *Diane Rizzo*

Despite recent technological advances the textbook remains a cornerstone for our educational system. The textbook represents the officially prescribed body of knowledge which the school-age child is to master. It is thus an important and unique authority for a young child.

Although the primary function of textbooks is to convey information about a specific subject area, textbooks also attempt to instruct the child in ethical and moral values. They portray what is good, desirable, and just. They provide the child with a vision of the future and aid him or her in establishing personal goals for the future. Thus, at the same time that a child is learning history and mathematics, books are also influencing values and aspirations. The results are that textbooks actually provide two distinct forms of knowledge to the young reader. The first kind of knowledge consists of information and skills in a specific subject. The second kind of information consists of ethical prescriptions, a vision of the good life, and the motivations and incentives to attain it.

This second type of information, what sociologists refer to as the "latent content" of textbooks, also conveys images of appropriate male and female behavior. Textbooks provide norms and standards for how men, women, boys, and girls should act. This research report focuses on the latent content of textbooks: it examines and analyzes the ways the two sexes are portrayed and the types of behavior encouraged for each.

The object of this research was to systematically analyse the textbooks being used in the average classrooms in the United States today in grades 1 through 6. Instead of examining the current best sellers, or the most innovative books, we sought to sample books that had been used in most schools during the past five years. In this way we hoped that our study would reflect the situation in the typical classroom in the United States, not just the avant-garde in education. An expert panel of educators and publishers was consulted to determine the most widely used textbooks over a five-year period[1] in science, mathematics, reading, spelling, and social studies.[2]

The major focus of this analysis was the textbook illustrations, as they provided a single uniform indicator with which to compare the different series. Each person in each illustration was categorized along 50 different dimensions including age, sex, race, expression, activity, and occupation. The coded data provided the basis for a systematic analysis of the representation of males and females, as well as the differences by grade level and subject area.

In examining the people in the world of textbooks, three major classifications were used: age, race, and sex.

With regard to age, we found that the majority of the pictures, 57 percent, are children, while adults are 43 percent. The large number of children in the illustrations makes it easier for a child to identify with the pictures and, therefore, to assimilate the lesson.

However, the higher the grade level, the larger the percentage of adults. While adults are only 28 percent of the pictures in the first grade, by the sixth grade they are 73 percent of the total. Thus the textbook world shifts from the world of the child to the world of the adult. And, as the child grows older, he or she is also supposed to shift to adult role models—to imagine the self as an adult and to learn what behavior is appropriate for an adult.

With regard to race, we found that the textbook world is primarily a white world. Whites are 81 percent of the illustrations, while only 8 percent are black, and even fewer are American Indian, Latin, Chicano, or Asian. This underrepresentation of minorities means that the minority child is more likely to feel excluded—and will have more difficulty in identifying with the textbook characters. In addition, all children are deprived of a well-rounded picture of our society.

As with age, the proportion of minority persons changes with the grade level of the textbook. In each series the proportion of minority persons decreases as the grade level of the textbooks increases. Thus 33 percent of the illustrations are of minority persons in the first grade, but this decreases to 26 percent by the sixth grade. In math the percentage of minority persons declines from 25 to 15 percent; and in science from 11 to 8 percent. Thus with each successive year, in each series, nonwhites are increasingly excluded from the world of textbooks.

Since women comprise 53 percent of the U.S. population, one might logically expect half of the illustrations to be female. However, females are only 31 percent of the textbook total—while males are 69 percent. Of the total of over 8,000 pictures analyzed, more than 5,500 are male. Males overwhelmingly predominate.

The percentage of females varies by grade level. They are 32 percent in the second grade but decline to only 20 percent by the sixth grade.

This means that by the sixth grade there are four pictures of males for every one picture of a female. The percentage of males, in contrast, increases with each grade level. As a greater proportion of the pictures become adults, women become less numerous, and by implication, less important as role models.

This declining representation of females is particularly striking in some of the series. For example, in spelling, 43 percent are females in the second grade, but by the time we reach the sixth grade the percentage has declined to a mere 15 percent. In science, it drops from 36 to 18 percent.

When we combine the sex and race categories, we find that minority females are doubly disadvantaged. There are only half as many minority females as minority males.

In summary, the data indicate that the textbook world is a world of white males, and as the textbooks increase in sophistication, with each grade level, they become increasingly adult-oriented, and women become increasingly invisible.

It is difficult to understand the impact that these pictures have on children without examining the illustrations themselves. However, several statistically significant differences in the illustrations should be noted.

In the pictures of children, there is a strong contrast between the activities of boys and girls. First, the world of boys is one of action and energy. In contrast, girls are typically shown as passive, watching and waiting for boys. Second, most boys are shown outdoors while a greater percentage of girls are shown indoors.

A third difference is in the traits encouraged in boys and girls. Boys are encouraged to be skillful and adventurous. In contrast, girls are encouraged to pursue homemaking and grooming. Throughout the textbooks girls are shown in domestic roles doing household chores, caring for others, helping their mothers, sewing, baking, mopping, making beds, dusting, and washing dishes. One message for a young girl is that she should learn to help, care for, and serve others.

Girls are also encouraged to make themselves attractive: they are shown combing their hair, trying on clothes, shopping for pretty things, sitting under the hair dryer, and being rewarded for their attractiveness. It is clear that feminine success is reserved for the pretty girl.

These pictures project the message that success for girls will lie in serving, pleasing, and watching others, while success for boys will result from independence and activity. If a little girl identifies with the pictures of girls in the texts, she will be assimilating a lesson of subservience and passivity. At the same time the little boy is learning to express independence and creativity.

A fourth difference in the images of boys and girls is in their emotional expression. Girls express a much wider range of emotions. They are affectionate and often shown hugging and nurturing pets and dolls. Girls also frighten easily and are often shown crying. In contrast, boys almost never cry, and the young boy is taught that to be a man he must control his emotions. Thus, in the same way that girls are constrained by images which stereotype them as passive, boys are constrained by images which stereotype them as strong and silent. The textbooks thereby encourage both boys and girls to limit themselves—to be less than full human beings.

Finally, it is interesting to note that in a significant minority of the illustrations with both boys and girls, most of the action centers around boys. Boys act, and girls watch. Often the girls seem thrilled just to watch the boys perform.

An examination of the images of adults in textbooks indicates that the adult world is a world of men. Men are shown in over 150 occupational roles—they are doctors, chefs, farmers, chemists, waiters, carpenters, pilots, etc. The illustrations of adult men are glamorous and exciting—and they stimulate young boys to dream about a wide range of occupational choices.

In contrast, choice is almost nonexistent for girls because the adult women in textbooks are all the same. Although adult women in our society do many things, almost all the women in textbooks are housewives.

The housewife in textbooks is hard to believe: she has little to do, everything goes smoothly, and she is always happy and calm. The reality and difficulties of managing a household (juggling the demands of husband, children, cleaning, cooking, shopping, laundry, entertaining, bookkeeping) and the many important volunteer activities of housewives should be discussed so that both boys and girls can understand their mother's complicated role.

Although the textbook housewife seems artificial, the image of mothers in textbooks is consistently positive–in fact, it is the most positive female image in textbooks.[3] Mothers are appreciated and loved, and there is a very warm and happy bond between mothers and their children. The problem is that motherhood is presented as the only option for girls—motherhood is shown as a full-time lifetime occupation. But, in reality, the average woman in the U.S. spends only one-third of her adult years raising children. Most women will want to work outside the home—or will have to work because of economic necessity—in the other two-thirds of their adult years. If our daughters are told to think only of motherhood in their futures, they will not develop the skills they will need for two-thirds of their lives.

Today, 40 percent of the United States labor force is female. In fact, 90 percent of all women in this country work outside their home at some point in their lives. One of the most frustrating experiences of working women is discovering too late that they don't have the skills or training they need for the jobs they want—or the jobs that pay well. And yet, the textbooks are encouraging the same mistake in our daughters. It is totally inaccurate to portray motherhood and work as mutually exclusive. Most girls will want both. The educational system is thwarting and simply cheating our daughters if it doesn't provide them with the skills and aspirations for both.

Although most textbook women are confined to their homes, a few are shown working. They are teachers, librarians, salesclerks, and nurses. Thus, girls' occupational choices, when they exist at all, are severely limited.

In contrast, by providing boys with over 150 occupational choices, the textbooks encourage young boys to imagine themselves in a wide variety or roles—and to dream of becoming anything from a laborer to a doctor.

While boys learn that an exciting future awaits them, the implicit message may also be a heavy responsibility. It is clear that men must have jobs. In fact, all men seem to do is work. This overwhelming occupational focus—and the frenetic activity encouraged in boys—may be what leads to so many ulcers and heart attacks in adult men. The death rate from heart attacks among men in the prime of their lives is four times as high as it is for women—and yet the textbooks seem to be stimulating the same hyperactivity in young boys.

Boys who are pressured to think only of work are being constrained in the same way as girls who are told to think only of motherhood. To confine either sex to stereotyped roles is to arbitrarily restrict their individual talents.

There are systematic differences in the treatment that women receive in the different subject areas. The percentage of women varies from a high of 33 percent in social studies to a low of 26 percent in science. These differences, although they may not appear to be dramatic, are important in understanding why children like certain subjects and want to major in them—or why, in contrast, they may feel unwelcome or excluded because of the covert messages they receive.

In science, the most male-oriented series, three out of every four pictures are males. Throughout the science series the textbooks seem to imply that females have no place in the world of science.

For example, when we open the first-grade science textbook, on the very first page we are told that we are going to learn about making things move. Immediately we learn it is boys who make things move. The next few pictures show boys riding bicycles and pushing objects. The following page contains a picture of a girl and movement, but here we find that the wind is propelling her balloon. It is clear she has no control over the movement of the balloon. The boy on the same page is throwing his basketball. This contrast continues throughout the series. When boys are shown, they are actively involved in experiments: looking through microscopes, pouring chemicals, and experimenting. Boys control the action, and it is they who demonstrate scientific principals of motion, growth, energy, and light.

In contrast, when girls are shown, they observe. They are shown smelling soap and perfume, and looking at rocks, thermometers, and their sunburns. In some pictures girls are used as the objects of experiments, being injured or having balls thrown at them.

Adult women fare even worse than girls do in the science series. While girls are only 20 percent of the total illustrations, adult women are a mere 6 percent. In some grades, such as the second-grade science book, the percentage of adult women is as low as 1 percent. This means that in the second-grade science book, there are no adult women in 99 out of every 100 pictures.

Although our knowledge of women in science is terribly incomplete—because of the burdens they have had in gaining recognition for their work—at a minimum the science books could mention Madame Curie or Mary Leaky. Instead, science textbooks give children the impression that no woman has—or can—play a role in building our scientific knowledge. The scientific world is presented as a masculine domain: all scientists are male, only men do scientific work. The epitome of the male prototype in science is the romantic emphasis on the astronaut. But, once again, it is only boys who are shown in astronaut costumes and in the text only boys are told to imagine that they can explore the moon.

In the mathematics textbooks most males are shown as mathematically competent, but some of the females have difficulty with simple addition and are shown as baffled by counting to 3 or 20. These "dumb girl" images are not only derogatory and insulting to a girl student trying to learn mathematics—but they clearly contradict reality, for girls do better than boys in mathematics in elementary school. Adult women are also stereotyped: they deal only with math problems of dividing pies and shopping, and some are portrayed as mathematically incompetent. It seems ironic that housewives—who use so much math in balancing bank accounts and managing household budgets—are shown as baffled by simple addition.

Another feature of the mathematics textbooks is the frequent use of sex as a category for dividing people. For example, in explaining set theory, girls are set off as people who sew and cry. When sex is used as a category, girls are told that they can be classified as different—as typically emotional or domestic.

There is also strong sex-stereotyping in the examples and math problems. Despite the Equal Pay Act of 1963 we found math problems in which girls were paid less than boys for the same work. It would be hard to imagine a textbook publisher allowing this example if a black boy was being paid less than a white boy.

In the reading series, story titles provide a good indicator of the relative importance of males and females. Boys predominate in every grade. We see that in total, there are 102 stories about boys, while only 35 are about girls. When we examine the stories, we find that even the female heroines reinforce the traditional female roles. For example, Kirsten, the heroine of a third-grade story, surprises the girls who have rejected her by making Danish cookies and having the most popular booth at the school fair. The moral in this story is that girls can succeed by cooking and serving others.

But Kirsten slights herself and the very skill that has earned her favor. She says: "It's easy; even I can do it and you know how stupid I am." Thus, even when girls succeed, they tend to deprecate themselves.

In contrast, boys show a great deal of confidence and camaraderie. Among both boys and men, male pride and male bonds are very strong.

In reading textbooks there are two kinds of roles in which females predominate. Although they are only a small percentage of the pictures, they are significant. First, more women than men are shown as mean or evil characters. It is women who are overrepresented among the witches and villains of the textbooks. By representing evil characters as women, the textbooks further reinforce the secondary status that women are accorded.

The second role in which there are more females than males is among people who are shown as clumsy or stupid, and as the foolish objects of a joke.

The antagonism toward women is even more pronounced in the spelling series. In the early spelling books the vowels are shown as females and the consonants are shown as males. Although one might expect statements about how necessary vowels are, or how we can't make words without them, instead the female vowels are treated in an antagonistic and derogatory manner. In the dialogue women are yelled at, kicked out, pushed around, used as puppets, and told to shut up.

The last series, social studies, is unique in several ways. It is the only series with a strong family orientation, and it has the largest percentage of females. Here, mothers are shown as skillful, and they play an important role in passing on their cultural tradition to their daughters. There are many pictures of mothers in other cultures teaching their daughters specific skills.

The social studies series is also unique in its presentation of men in a parental role. There are many warm and tender pictures of fathers and sons; fathers instruct their sons in specific vocational skills—as well as in the ways of life.

Although we applaud these pictures of fathers and sons, it should be noted that fathers teach their sons—but not their daughters. Similarly, mothers teach only their daughters. Thus, once again boys learn vocational skills and girls learn domestic skills. Because the two sexes are segregated, and each sex learns a limited range of skills, traditional sex roles are perpetuated. Today, boys need to learn to manage in the home and to be parents, and girls need to learn about vocations and the outdoors. Again the textbooks could expand rather than thwart the children's potential.

The social studies series is also unique in its presentation of racial and ethnic minorities and the attention it gives to people of other cultures. The percentage of minorities varies by series—from a low of 10 percent in science to a high of 44 percent in social studies. Social studies is by far the best series in its representation of nonwhite and minority persons. The large number of blacks in this series demonstrates that pressure against textbook publishers can have some effect.

However, it is disappointing to note that publishers have not yet made the same effort with regard to women. Although this series has the largest percentage of females in pictures, still two out of every three are male. Once we move away from the home, we find that women are absent from the discussion of history, government, and society. The ways of life are still portrayed as "The Ways of Man."

After studying these textbooks for two years, we cannot help but conclude that our children are being crippled by the latent messages in their textbooks. Why not examine the textbooks you use again: count the number of males and females in the first hundred pages and examine the ways in which each sex is stereotyped. We urge you to examine the textbooks yourselves because only you can change the impact that these textbooks will have on our daughters and our sons and on the next generation of adults.

The Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education has developed suggestions for what students, teachers, teacher groups, administrators, parents, and community groups can do to counteract the covert messages in textbooks. These suggestions appear in this book as a chapter entitled "What You Can Do About Biased Textbooks."

What is most sorely lacking in the texbooks, and thus most desperately needed in the classroom, is a new image of adult women and a wide range of adult role models for young girls. Both girls and boys should learn about the history of women in this country; about women's suffrage, and the current women's liberation movement and struggle for equality; and about the female heroines of our country and our world. Girls of all racial and ethnic minority groups need to understand the roles that their foremothers have played in the development of our society. What a difference it would make if young girls could point to adult women with pride—and feel that they had an exciting life ahead. This is an imperative for our children, ourselves and our society.

FOOTNOTES

1. The sample was drawn from the teacher associations in each of these areas, faculty at educational and research insitutions, and the publishers of textbooks mentioned as leaders in the field. In each subject area we tried to determine the books with the largest sales and usage pattern over the five-year period from 1967 to 1972.

2. The consensus on the most widely used series varied greatly by discipline. In spelling there was almost complete agreement, and the McGraw Hill series "Basic Goals and Spelling" was used. In science the Harcourt Brace series "Concepts in Science" was used. In mathematics the Houghton Mifflin series, "Modern School Mathematics Structure and Use," was analyzed. In reading two series appeared equal, and both were used in the analysis. These were Scott Foresman's series "New Basic Readers," and Ginn and Co.'s "Basic Readers—100 Edition." In social studies, we found the least amount of consensus, as the field was undergoing major change. We therefore deviated from our established pattern and chose a newer series, Harcourt Brace's "The Social Sciences—Concepts and Values," which appeared to be capturing the current market.

3. Mothers, however, conform to the textbook norm of domestic women and are not active. The only women in textbooks who are active are aunts and grandmothers—women who have no children of their own or who are beyond the childbearing age—as if the textbooks have to dichotomize the role of mother from those roles which show women as active and energetic people.

10. The White Male Club

By Robert Terry

A recent advertisement for U.S. Savings Bond communicated a more profound message than intended. It captured on one page the heart of much of the American experience. Headlined "Welcome to the club," it invited the reader to join the ten white male executives pictured and buy savings bonds. That more than half of all Americans might not identify with a club led by such corporate leaders seems to have escaped the ad's creators.

Much of what has happened and continues to happen in America can be understood more completely if we analyze this country as a white male club, committed to technological superiority and dominance on the world scene.

This club is an organization which arbitrarily selects members and bestows appropriate material and psychological benefits. It distributes influence and power among its members and then uses that power to dominate groups unlike itself (consciously or unconsciously). It rigidly regulates behavior and demands conformity as a requirement of admittance, and it legitimizes certain lifestyles and requires at least public acquiescence to them.

In America, the application of this concept of club results in the conclusion that our country is a white male operation. Although relatively few white males run the club, all are offered benefits—even if they are only psychological. Minorities and white women are relegated to a secondary status and are exploited for club purposes when deemed necessary.

From its inception this country has been a haven for white males, compared to everyone else. Its relationship with Native Americans, the structuring of the Constitution, and its dominant institutions have perpetuated white male supremacy. We have witnessed over the years many attacks on the club—partly efforts to break it open and partly efforts to change its character. However, the club has been resistant to changes—making only those necessary to quell an immediate disturbance without fundamentally affecting the character and vitality of the club itself.

This resistance to change is partly due to our tendency to examine and try to change the victims of injustice rather than the forces perpetuating injustice. This approach has failed to produce much progress toward eliminating either racism or sexism. The focus needs to shift to an analysis of the "system" as a whole.

When examining any society, organization, or relatively permanent group, it is critical to isolate and analyze four interdependent aspects. Any slighting or overemphasis of one or more of these aspects distorts a comprehensive view of what is going on. It is essential to know:

- Who has access to societal resources?
- Are the resources equitably distributed?
- Who holds power? Who can marshall the resources to accomplish a goal?
- What are the institutionalized patterns and practices of the club?
- What are the dominant and persistent cultural values and assumptions of the club?

A quick review of what has been happening to the club over the last few years is important, especially for those who believe the club is making great strides forward.

The challenge to the club has long been joined around the issue of membership. Belonging to the club meant access to resources. Under what terms and conditions would membership be offered to and/or demanded by minority people and white women?

Membership has always been presupposed for white males. Of course, not all white males have participated in the same way, but individual hard work, initiative, and struggle could pay off. Although white males were not assured of success in the club, they were not penalized for their race or sex. Membership in good standing was their birthright.

Native Americans bore (and continue to bear) the brunt of club supremacy. Genocide, broken treaties, club controlled reservations, and false promises of urban resources marked the club's relationship to the tribes.

Blacks were treated in two ways. In the South, blacks were permitted great social intimacy with whites—caring for white children, cooking, housekeeping—as long as they were under club control. At no point could any kind of equality be tolerated.

In the North,the club preserved social distance—locking blacks into ghettoes while perpetuating the myth of Northern freedom. Blacks could do as they pleased, just as long as they kept their distance.

White women have long struggled to belong as well. However, their peculiar position—being both white and women—created confusion in many women as well as opportunities for white male manipulation. Because many white women accepted and relished white male protection of their womanhood, they refused to look at their own suppressed condition. Particularly in the South, white women's protection had a racial dimension, and meant guarding against supposed black assault.

However, many women also realized their awkward club status—supposed privilege and protection without real access to resources and power. They were being exploited while being protected. Thus white male leadership was able to perpetuate sexually-oriented racial myths while simultaneously legitimizing restricted, stereotyped role definitions for women, designed to keep them in subservient and controllable positions.

Anne Braden grasps the double bind of white women well. In a pamphlet directed to her Southern white sisters regarding a black man—Thomas Wansley—held in a trumped-up rape case of a white woman, she says:

> I believe that no white woman reared in the South—or perhaps anywhere in this racist country—can find freedom as a woman until she deals in her own consciousness with the question of race. We grow up little girls, absorbing a hundred stereotypes about ourselves and our role in life—our secondary position, our destiny to be a help mate to a man or men.
>
> But we also grow up white—absorbing the stereotypes of race, the picture of ourselves as somehow privileged because of the color of our skin. The two mythologies become intertwined, and there is no way to free ourselves from one without dealing with the other . . . .
>
> It may seem paradoxical, but in this racist society we who are white will overcome our oppression as women only when we reject once and for all the privileges conferred on us by our white skin. For the privileges are not real—they are a device through which we are kept under control.

In spite of slave insurrections, civil war, the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, the women's suffrage movement leading to the 19th amendment, the civil rights movement, urban rebellions, and the contemporary feminist movement, the club persists. Racism and sexism thrive. Equal access to resources is still an ideal and not reality.

As long as the symbol of individual initiative and free market competition had some real roots in American experience, the myth of achievement by bootstrap could persist. But, as the frontier mentality was buffeted by two world wars and a depression, contradictions soon surfaced.

After World War II, the ground rules for club membership changed drastically. America became a vast network of interlocking support systems that required a level of technical capacity and sophistication unparalled in history. Yet, at the same time, this network—able to produce and distribute goods in seemingly unlimited quantity—was destroying the very resources necessary to sustain it. The means of production were undermining the capacity to produce.

Participants in this technological process were either in on the ground floor or cast into marginal roles. The myth of individualism now has no foundation in fact. Individualism contradicts material interdependence and the requirement for technical competence. The ground rules for membership have changed. In his book *Being Free*, Gibson Winter sharpens the picture for us:

> In a high technology society, one either belongs at the outset or one is out for good. One starts inside or he [sic] never starts. Such are the terms of membership in the technically competent society.
>
> Without health, intellectual preparation, personal discipline and many other qualities, the opportunities of a high technology society are closed. The ceiling is zero . . . the distance between the included and the excluded grows at an accelerating pace.

Many believe that the club is opening its doors to new members. A variety of statistics are marshalled to argue the case that there has been, in fact, dramatic redistribution of resources. The best-known expression of this thesis is contained in the article "Black Progress and Liberal Rhetoric," by Ben J. Wattenberg and Richard M. Scammon (*Commentary*, April 1973).

The authors argue that a remarkable, even revolutionary, development has taken place in America over the last dozen years. They believe that a majority of black Americans now are "middle class." The authors present data demonstrating that black family income climbed from 53 percent of white family income in 1961 to 63 percent in 1971. They also point to the fact that black families earning above $10,000 increased from 13 percent in 1961 to 30 percent in 1971, using equivalent 1971 dollar figures.

The authors assert that large numbers of blacks now "belong." They argue that a rise in income means the rest of middle class values and goals follow. The authors suggest:

> Once the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing are provided for, a vast flow of secondary desires follows. A middle income family wants not only a house that is safe and sanitary, but one in a safe and sanitary neighborhood. Middle income parents want their children to go to good schools, to stay in high school and graduate and, they hope, then go on to college. The young

> adults who come out of high school and college want better jobs than those their parents have held, the kinds of jobs that have always been available to whites in an equivalent socio-economic position. The middle income blacks . . . have made much headway toward satisfying all these traditional middle class desires.

At no point do the authors argue that enough is being done, but they resent the fact that black and white liberals play down progress when it seemed so dramatic.

Karl Gregory, consultant and economist, has criticized the article, saying that the authors "neglected to state that while the ratio of black incomes to white incomes has indeed risen, the absolute gap in purchasing power between whites and blacks has also expanded." Gregory suggests that income alone is an insufficient measure of the distribution of societal resources. Income must be distinguished from wealth.

"Black families," he states, "own less than 2 percent of the nation's wealth, and about 70 percent of the little they own is in the form of the wealth that is least associated with power, namely, equity in a home."

Scammon and Wattenberg also ignored or glossed over much of the institutional quality of racism. Many authors have documented the fact that the poor pay more for equivalent services. And the *Commentary* article assumed that all middle class values are equally shared by whites and blacks. We will say more about that later.

Racism and sexism interlock to produce predictable results. Economist John Kenneth Galbraith reports a startling statistic: "White males hold 96 percent of America's over $15,000 a year jobs; women and blacks divide the remaining 4 percent."

Government sources report that in 1971 unemployment was lowest for white adult males (4 percent) and highest for minority teenage girls (35.5 percent). In 1970, the median income from fulltime, year-round employment exhibited a similar pattern:

White men $9373
Black men $6598
White women $5490
Black women $4674

This pattern continues to hold even when education levels are kept constant. Housing and health care show similar patterns.

Many social activists and social scientists stop here. They assert that equal access to resources is the essential criterion to measure social progress in America. Behind this position is an assumption: assimilation is the solution to racial and sexual discrimination. Race and sex should predict nothing of significance. The club is basically healthy; it only needs to eliminate exclusionary practices to make it fair.

This problem is held by many minority people and white women, but primarily by white males. However, an increasing number of people are questioning "integrating into the club." Integration by race and sex is being viewed as racist and sexist, insofar as it means "You can make it in the club if you act like white males."

Although others are even questioning the idea of the club itself, most minority people and white women agree that some form of inclusion in the club is absolutely essential. The debate hinges on the terms of inclusion. Those terms necessitate an examination of power, institutional practices, and cultural standards. Can the club be transformed into a society open on the basis of both race and sex practicing a humanized technology, domestically and internationally?

Having access to resources is necessary but not sufficient to possess power. One has power when one can mobilize resources to accomplish one's goals. The key to power is the effective conversion ratio of assets into concentrated and concerted action. A small group of people may convert 90 percent of its assets into action and force change opposed by a larger force that does not choose to marshall resources in resistance. This phenomenon accounts for the ability of the civil rights movement to have new laws enacted. The possibility of confronting power becomes more difficult, however, because of a further characteristic of high technology societies.

That characteristic is the new concentration of power in machines, materials, and decision making.

White males dominate the corporate centers of technological power. Their control is buttressed by an over-representation in the institutions designed to regulate that power—the military, courts, police, and federal, city, and state governments.

It is encouraging to see black mayors elected in major cities. But in each case we must watch carefully how whites retain important checks on black power in government councils, courts, civil service, and police. Hopefully, black leadership will gain enough support to be able to test new programs and policies.

Although the election of blacks is encouraging, the larger picture is not as encouraging. For example, increasing concern exists in some white quarters in Congress and the Pentagon that the voluntary military is attracting too many minority people—presently, about 35 percent. The concern is based on the fantasy that military power will not enforce club interests—a fantasy not based in reality. The promotion process will certainly weed out resisters to military orientation and select loyal military personnel. However, some are still anxious that lower level troops will not be obedient to upper level orders.

Many powerful sections of the trade union movement have not followed up on earlier promises of equality to women or minorities. Most large unions are controlled by white males, even when their union membership is predominantly minority or female or both. These leaders have often adopted positions supporting blacks and women with regard to civil rights legislation and the Equal Rights Amendment, but they have not allocated power internally on a truly representative basis.

The passing of the present generation of union leadership combined with the pressure of the civil rights and women's movements offer the first prospects of change in many years. It is likely that the newer unions involved with groups such as farmworkers and hospital workers will lead the way. But strong resistance remains, particularly within the construction trade unions. Their desire to maintain a monopoly on the skilled work force has led them to resist aggressive hiring and promotion of minorities.

Some argue that white women possess inordinate power through control of stocks. Half of all stockholders are women. However, men carry out 75 percent of all securities transactions, according to the New York Stock Exchange. Women often control stock in name only to suit their husbands' tax purposes. In any case, they hold only 42 percent of the dollar value and 38 percent of the total number of shares—mostly in small chuncks.

In industry, those bearing the brunt of social change are at the bottom of the organization. The white males in that position are the ones actually affected by their bosses' decisions to obey Order 4 (the requirement that Government contractors have an aggressive affirmative action program). Dramatic moves to shift power at the top of these organizations have not occurred. My own efforts as a consultant to get white males to share power, although meeting with some success, encounter endless rationalizations and diversionary tactics.

Implicit behind much white male resistance is the assumption that blacks are ill-prepared for major management responsibility, coupled with the fear that blacks will treat whites the same way whites have treated blacks. Women face a similar kind of resistance; the threat of the women's movement—in the form of court cases, back pay awards, and new union organizing—is just beginning to be felt in industry.

The power to mobilize resources into action is obviously in male hands—but not totally! Some activists use such terms as "the powerful and the powerless," "master and slave," "colonizer and colonized." Although the rhetoric is stirring, it perpetuates the idea that people cannot change the system. Power is certainly not easily given up, usually it is taken—if not by force, at least through strenuous organizing and hard work. Yet changes do occur—and for at least two reasons.

First, not all powerful white males in the club agree. The Vietnam war is a vivid example.

Secondly, not all white males have equal power. Even though white males as a group have a disproportionate share of club resources, the decision makers are relatively few. The club obviously has leaders and followers.

The club leadership must convince lower-level males that they receive sufficient benefits from the club not to worry about gross power disparities. It may be income, a rewarding job, or leisure time. It may be just a psychological benefit—"at least I ain't a nigger."

However, an increasing number of white males, although still too few, are catching on to the club trick—convincing someone that nothing is something. The club, they are beginning to see—not minority people and white women—is the cause of injustice in the society.

Promoting minority people and white women to positions of increased responsibility changes the color and sex composition of power, but does not necessarily change its oppressive use. As one black man put it, "A cop is a cop, black or white. They work for the man and they will kill you just as dead."

Institutional practices and policies set structure, define roles, and allocate rewards and punishments. They are the backbone of the club: its constitution. To fit into one of the roles is to take on the task of club maintenance. Minority people and white women can humanize that process to some degree. But the pressures to conform to typical role expectations are great, especially as one moves up the institutional ladder.

Because of the tremendous influence of institutions, institutionalized sexism and racism have been key targets for change. While most of our political, economic, educational, and religious institutions were just developing during the early stages of our history, slavery was already highly institutionalized. Some commentators have argued that slavery was the first well developed institution in America. With this head start, a web of racism developed that persists to the present. To be racist or sexist today only requires that one be "normal." In his essay, "The Web of Urban Racism," social scientist Harold Baron states it well:

> Maintenance of the basic racial controls . . . is now less dependent upon specific discriminatory decisions. Such behavior has become so well institutionalized that the individual generally does not have to exercise a choice to operate in a racist [and/or sexist] manner. The rules and procedures of the large organizations have already prestructured the choice. The individual only has to conform to the operating norms of the organization and the institution will do the discriminating for him [sic].

Interestingly, the status of slaves paralleled the status of women in America, and slaves were oftened likened to women or children. As Gunnar Myrdal pointed out in the appendix to his famous book on racial discrimination, *An American Dilemma:*

> In the earlier common law, women and children were placed under the jurisdiction of the paternal power. When a legal status had to be found for the imported Negro servants in the 17th century, the nearest and most natural analogy was the status of women and children. The Ninth Commandment—linking together women, servants, mules, and other property—could be invoked, as well as a great number of other passages of Holy Scripture.

Of course, as Myrdal points out, the plight of women was entirely different. They were perceived as ornaments, while slaves were laborers.

Nevertheless, pro-slavery writers frequently defended slave-holding as similar to having a wife. Myrdal points out that the parallel went beyond an ideological argument. Women in fact had few of the rights otherwise accorded to free white citizens. The close relationship of the positions of white women and of slaves was summed up by Dolley Madison, whom Myrdal quotes as saying that the Southern wife was "the chief slave of the harem."

Whether it is seniority systems, selection of textbooks, hiring and promotion practices, or educational testing and tracking—traditional practices reinforce club control. Even when organizations try to institute practices and policies that are more flexible and responsive to their membership, old practices persist.

For example, companies forced to comply with revised Order 4 often get quite imaginative in recruiting and enrolling white women and minority people. These moves are all to the good. However, the company continues to hire white males in the same old way. The message is clear. The outsiders will have to fit into the club; white males—who implicitly belong—will not have to be screened in any different way to fit into a newly open organization.

If the club were firmly committed to becoming such an organization, it would require that those not firmly committed to an antiracist and anti-sexist posture either be refused employment or required to get additional training. That is how other employment standards are handled.

What the club fails to realize is that the pressures for fundamental change will not cease just because melanin and chromasomes are widely distributed in the organization. The pressures for change go far beyond inclusion on white male terms.

And of course not all the practices and policies of any given organization or society need changing. The concern here is that such practices and policies be flexible and responsive to the members of the organization. Instead, we frequently find the opposite. Hospitals, for example, are often designed to satisfy the medical profession more than the community which they ostensibly serve.

The pattern of relationships within organizations must be changed. Racism and sexism are perpetuated more by everyday role definitions than by psychic needs of individuals to be superior. To change institutional structure is to go a long way in eliminating racism and sexism.

The club legitimizes itself by appealing to common definitions and values that are supposedly shared by society. These assumptions are usually taken for granted and operate at a subconscious level. They become overt only when threatened—as, for example, in abortion reform, the Equal Rights Amendment, and school busing for integration. The result is intensive political struggle.

In the context of club life, cultural standards mean at least three things.

First, ethnocentric standards are used to measure acceptability into the club. Unfamiliar behavior is usually interpreted negatively. If the Afro is too big, it may be signifying militancy; if minority people eat together, it is a sign of separatism; if women want an offsite meeting for themselves, an anti-male action is underway. Gross denial and ridicule are two of the many ways the club has to sidestep or deprecate authentic anti-racist or anti-sexist activities.

Value orientations are a second dimension of cultural standards. Not all white males accept them. Nor do all white women and minority people deny them. But enough evidence exists to question the assumption that a basic value consensus really exists in America.

The white male, Western, highly technological society rewards individual initiative; encourages competition; supports dispassionate, objective, and analytic thinking, and provides for creativity and personal advancement within the system. But many minority people and white women are discovering a different value orientation within themselves because of their oppressed and suppressed positions in the club.

In place of individual initiative, blacks, Chicanos, and other groups—more recently, white women in large numbers—value communal experience. "No one makes it until the whole group makes it" is a growing conviction among these groups.

The image of the strong dominating entrepreneur, risking and competing for advancement, is challenged by a collaborative, open, non-aggressive style. For most whites, pro-black means anti-white. For most men, pro-woman means anti-male. This kind of "I win, you lose" mentality is under question.

White males are taught from childhood to restrain tears, suppress feelings, and "be rational." White women, in contrast, are allowed to be emotional and are rewarded for "mothering." Minority people, who have been forced to trust their feelings in sizing up potentially hostile situations in and around the club, are also much more alive emotionally.

It is no accident, therefore, that the white middle class has been the main "consumer" of sensitivity training. White men are seeking ways to get in touch with feelings; white women are seeking legitimate avenues to express feelings.

The club does reward creativity and personal advancement if one obeys the system. For years, white males have been promised that hard work, education, and ability pay off. The club has been a good place for competent creative strivers. As a result, white males often find themselves living in a myth world—frustrated and demoralized when the system does not deliver on its promise.

Minority people and a growing number of white women, in contrast, have had to face the club's lie repeatedly. Only by going outside club rules, or by using them against the club, have basic changes been possible. Authentic creativity is rooted in the capacity to doubt past traditions and form new ones. Those most experienced in that process are those who have survived by coping creatively with the club itself.

Readers steeped in a competitive mind set will probably conclude from this discussion that one must choose only one set of values. A both/and approach rather than an either/or approach is more appropriate.

White male technology needs humanizing, not total elimination. Its effects need redirection, not cancellation. Bringing together the strengths of both sets of values—a process of cultural synergism—is absolutely essential if any alternative to the club is to emerge.

The third aspect of cultural standards is the capacity of the club to misplace the problem. To examine racism and sexism one must look beyond facts and statistics, at the character of the club itself. Racism and sexism in America are not problems simply to be listed alongside other problems. They are part of the club's foundation.

In order to resist such scrutiny and change, the club blames the victim for its problems. One dramatic example was the Kerner Commission report on civil disorders, which had an auspicious beginning. It said in one paragraph that the basic problem was white racism. But having said that, it went on to propose massive training programs, education, etc. for the victims—implying that it was their fault after all.

Much of the social science literature and the media depict minorities as culturally deprived and unqualified. They are labeled as disadvantaged, unreliable, too aggressive, militant, or expecting too much. Women are called too emotional, unqualified to manage and make hard decisions, better equipped for certain kinds of roles (i.e., secretarial, because women "can type"; teaching, because women know how to take care of children). In each of these cases the focus on the victim removes pressure from the club.

Victim blame by the victor is a survival mechanism. Those who win can attribute their success to the incompetence of the losers. When it comes to race and sex, it is clear who gets blamed.

It is essential to understand that I am suggesting that the club is the problem—not white males *per se*. It is more a question of social system than it is of biology.

White males have options in relation to the club. They can actively defend and perpetuate it; they can react passively and conform to club pressures; or they can actively work to change the club. One cannot be passively anti-racist and anti-sexist. That option does not exist in America today. To be passive is to conform to the club and to support it.

From this analysis it follows that racism is fundamentally white racism and sexism is fundamentally male sexism. Minority people are not racist nor are women sexist on their own. (Individual minority people and women who do express anti-white and anti-male feelings are the logical out-growth of a society which is racist and sexist. In any case, minority people and white women in general have at this point neither the access nor the power needed to direct club life.)

Minority people and white women can, however, act to perpetuate the white male club. Blacks can be white racists and women can be male sexists. All they need to do is imitate white male behavior.

In order to make sure that the victim is not being blamed, one examines the club to see if the resources are being equitably distributed; power is being shared; institutions are becoming flexible and responsive to their constituencies; and cultural standards are becoming synergistic.

It is a mistake to think that since the club is the problem, white males are the solution. On the contrary, it takes everyone to change the club.

There is no doubt the club is changing, albeit all too slowly. There is also no doubt that today the club is divided against itself. It is in the midst of political crisis.

Tremendous pressure exists to solve the crisis so that club leadership can close ranks and return to some kind of normalcy. That return does not seem likely for some time. If challenges to the club are sophisticated enough, that return may never come. If ecologists, the poor, white women, and minority people begin a common struggle to humanize the technological order, then normalcy and justice could become colleagues.

If that does not happen, the club will continue old patterns, attempting to pacify and/or eliminate dissent. Either way, the solidarity of the club can be maintained.

Overt oppression in which the club mobilizes appropriate force to dominate and control masses of minority people and white women is always a possibility. It need not be conspiratorial. FBI disruption of political groups, the medical experimentation on black males at Tuskegee, the involuntary sterilization of women in North and South Carolina and Alabama, and continued broken treaties with Native Americans—all of these are ways in which the club controls and oppresses outsiders.

Of particular concern lately is the growing popularity in some governmental circles of works by Edward Banfield, David Armor, and Arthur Jensen—all of which legitimize cutting back federal programs to aid minorities.

Banfield would cease all aid to cities on the grounds it does no good. Armor has tried to prove that blacks do not benefit from attending better schools through desegregation. Jensen is popularizing white supremacy in the guise of scientific formulations.

Although these theories do not have widespread support in academic circles, they are receiving attention elsewhere and have the potential, if it is not already realized, to become the rationale for restricting programs to change the club's character. Although all three have received much publicity, their critics have not had equal time.

Similarly, many authors are writing books which would justify the current status of women in society. Such titles as *The Inevitability of Patriarchy* by Stephen Goldberg, *Men in Groups* by Lionel Tiger, *Sexual Suicide* by George Guilder, *Manipulated Man* by Esther Vilar, and *The New Chastity* by Midge Decter all offer various rationalizations for the "natural" dominance of man over woman. All these authors implicitly or explicitly attack the goals of the women's movement and label its female advocates psychologically "unbalanced."

The other major alternative strategy used by the club is pacification. This kind of activity is more difficult to identify because it has the appearance of change without its substance. Samuel Yette in his book *The Choice* documents a number of pacification efforts and their outcome. Two particular pacification approaches are gaining popular currency today and need to be examined.

The first approach is color and sex blindness. There was a time when the federal government felt that the elimination of racial references from application forms would encourage entry of new employees into the club. Following this line of reasoning, the government required industry to eliminate all such references from personnel forms and to adopt a non-discriminatory or a sex and color blind policy. Over the years it was found that this policy did not, in fact, produce change.

One could argue that it was never really tried, or that it was tried in a perfunctory fashion. Color and sex blind policies sound on their face to be fair. It is wrong to discriminate. However, to be color and sex blind in a racist and sexist society was to be passive. Everything stayed the same, except the club said the door is open. Hiring and promotion policies continued unexamined. Companies recruited from the same white male campuses. No examination was made of entry requirements or other institutional practices and policies that perpetuated the club ethos.

The government—in response to increasing demands from blacks and then Chicanos, Native Americans, Asians, and now women—has moved to a new policy: affirmative action. This policy requires that large organizations be color and sex conscious in their hiring and promotion. That is a step in the right direction. But, as this policy begins to take hold, forces are mounting to return to color blindness.

If color and sex blindness is reinstated, it will represent a victory for white male supremacy. Discrimination excludes groups of people on the basis of arbitrary criteria. Racism and sexism, as we have tried to show, involve more than just exclusion. Thus, to move against racism is a more involved and radical process than simply eliminating discrimination. If one is only non-discriminatory, one ends up being racist and sexist.

The second pacification alternative that is gaining popularity within certain circles of the club is encouraging ethnic pluralism. On the one hand, pluralism is an important value and stands in contradiction to the club's tendency to assimilate white males. For that it should be applauded and supported.

However, ethnic consciousness without an understanding of racism and sexism becomes a conspirator with the club to maintain white male control. The reason for this is relatively simple. Ethnic groups have as a part of their history in this country the fact of their whiteness. That fact accrued benefits upon them regardless of their intention or condition. Ethnic groups were able to assimilate if they desired.

This is not to underplay the serious struggles and battles that ethnic groups faced in dealing with the WASP version of the club. However, Poles, Irish, and Italians were eventually able to change their identity to fit into the club. They could become invisible.

Invisibility was not possible for blacks, nor is it really possible for white women. The extent to which white ethnic groups do not recognize their whiteness as a part of their ethnic history in this country is the extent to which they can easily be deluded about their own advancement in the club and manipulated to perceive minority people as their enemy.

No one is free until all are free. In a racist, sexist society all of us are initially captives. The type of captivity may impinge on various racial and sexual groups differently, but its impact is just as destructive. Liberation involves four things—a new self-understanding, a clear self-interest in change, a comprehensive social analysis, and a political strategy and appropriate tactics.

To free oneself from the club and to change it, one must question its assumptions and carve out a new self-understanding—both individually and as a member of a group. Minority people have been involved in that process for a longer time than either white women or white men. White women have made great strides in the last few years.

It is understandable that white men will be the last to see the need for a new self-perception, although an increasing number are beginning to grasp the necessity for a new white male identity.

Nothing is automatic about a new self-understanding. It must be both color and sex conscious, and develops only as a result of disciplined reflection and involvement in change. I get uneasy when I hear anyone say that they have arrived and that they are at a higher level of consciousness than someone else. Such elitism can only lead to alienation between people and a perpetuation of a hierarchical mentality.

Sending each other on guilt trips or punishing each other will not do the job. We need to learn how to affirm ourselves—be we red, brown, yellow, black, or white, male or female. And we need to support each other's struggles in our common quest for a new self-definition.

To work for self-interest is to walk a fine line between selfishness and sacrifice. Many groups new to social change fail to clarify the reasons they are in the change effort. Then when the going gets tough, they drop out.

To be freed from the club we have to be clear why and how the club is not serving our best interests. For some people it may be that it violates their personal integrity to participate in a fundamentally unjust system. For others it may be the realization that they are paying more for housing, crime, and inefficient use of resources to perpetuate an unjust system. For still others it may be the fear that unless things change no one will make it.

No single self-interest argument or reality hits everyone the same way. Each of us has to find his or her own self-interest around particular issues and in the general struggle. Our self-interest may change or it may stay the same. In either case the task is to combine a new self-understanding with a sharpened perception of why we are in the struggle.

Not everyone opposed to the present club arrangement will agree on one economic or political analysis. That is to be expected. However, we must be willing to think through and test our alternatives. Do they end up perpetuating the club? Or do they really change it to benefit all? Perhaps nothing is worse than activists highly committed to change without a plan that outlines what they are changing and toward what ends.

One driving force sustains us in the struggle: the conviction that we are all working for our common liberation and for justice.

Robert Terry is a consultant on racism, sexism, and institutional change with the Detroit firm of Neely, Campbell, Gibb, Terry, and Associates.

11. All Men Are Created Equal

(Reprinted from *A Guide to Federal Laws and Regulations Prohibiting Sex Discrimination*, Clearinghouse Publication No 46, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 1976, revised.)

The Declaration of Independence proclaims that all men are created equal. Unfortunately, the word "men" has been taken too literally, resulting in the principle that women are created unequal. With this practice the rule, rather than the exception, the issue of the legal rights of women in American society has been debated throughout the history of our country. Though these debates have focused mainly on political and employment rights, discrimination against women has been manifested also in such areas as public accommodations and facilities, public education, criminal laws and the administration of justice, tax and retirement benefits, consumer credit, mortgage finance, insurance, property rights, and rental and finance contracts. In short, discrimination against women exists in every facet of American society.

Women thus have been confined to a different, and by most standards, inferior status. They have been stigmatized historically as an inferior class; and discrimination against women, though often different in kind and intensity, has been as pervasive as the discrimination experienced by racial, ethnic, and religious minorities in this country. Although numerically women are a majority of the population, they, like minorities, lack the political power to remedy the discriminatory treatment they are accorded in the law and in American society.

This inferior status, tolerated and accepted as natural throughout our country's history, is reflected in our legal system. In common law, women were accorded few if any rights, none of which were substantial. For instance, women were not allowed to enter into contracts, hold property, or maintain legal action. In fact, it was not until 1920 that women of all races finally acquired the right to vote through passage of the 19th amendment.

The women's movement of the 19th century addressed itself to a wide variety of issues in its attempt to eliminate discrimination against women. Nineteenth century feminists spoke out and demonstrated against restrictive marriage and family laws and against discrimination in education, employment, property rights, and reproductive freedom, to name but a few. Throughout these years, feminists perceived the need for political power and influence for women. They understood that without the basic right to participate in the political process through exercise of the elective franchise, alterations in women's status would depend solely on the good will of the men in power and would be slow in coming. By the end of the century, therefore, the struggle for women's rights concentrated on obtaining the right to vote as a first step toward obtaining full equality for women under the law. While the right to vote is basic to the achievement of other rights, the 19th amendment could not cure all ills and alter the inferior status decreed by American society for women. Consequently, "woman's place" as subordinate to man was and still is, to some extent, reflected in existing laws and practices.

During recent years, outspoken feminists have compelled the courts and legislatures to view the role and status of women from a different perspective. Through the courts, they have demanded equal protection of the laws and vindication of their fundamental constitutional rights. The achievement of equal opportunity for women, however, is still blocked by political, social, economic, and legal barriers, many of which are sanctioned by the law.

Some efforts have been made at both the federal and state levels to offer relief from discriminatory practices. While these developments represent one step toward the protection of the equal rights of women and men, they are only initial steps, piecemeal in nature and with very limited scope. This is what makes the passage of the equal rights amendment (ERA) so imperative. The amendment reads:

> Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.
>
> Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
>
> Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

Passage of the equal rights amendment would provide the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the law for both women and men, which has not been guaranteed by any other means. The Supreme Court, for example, has not ruled that sex, like race, is a "suspect classification" and, thus, has not extended the full protection of the 14th amendment to women. Although piecemeal revision of federal and state laws would accomplish essentially the same goal as the equal rights amendment, the process would require an inordinate amount of time, precision, planning, and legislative effort. The ERA will create a uniform national standard and mandate for such legislative reform because it will establish the principle that all persons, regardless of sex, must be treated as individuals rather than as representatives of the actual or alleged characteristics of a group; although the amendment applies only to governmental, not private, action.

Thus, laws which confer a benefit or obligation on one sex would be revised to cover both sexes. This would include, for example, extending to men the beneficial provisions of protective labor legislation, such as those which provide lounge facilities and rest periods for women workers only. Laws that provide of alimony and child support to the wife in a divorce settlement would be revised so that the criterion for granting such support would be the ability of each spouse to make such payments, rather than the individual's sex. Laws which restrict opportunity to one sex, and thus deny opportunity to the other sex, would be invalidated. "Domicile" laws in many states, which prohibit a wife from maintaining a legal residence different from that of her husband and thus limit her ability to register to vote, would not be allowed. Protective labor laws which restrict the number of hours women are permitted to work and the amount of weight they are permitted to lift would be invalidated.

Laws creating age distinctions on the basis of sex, such as those which define legal adulthood differently on the basis of sex or establish a different age of consent to marry without parental permission for women and men, for example, would be unconstitutional.

Laws that distinguish between women and men on the basis of alleged physical differences, such as those preventing women from engaging in military combat, would be invalidated, unless such laws are based on characteristics that apply to women but not to any men, or on characteristics of men but not of any women. Laws governing the determination of paternity, for example, would not be invalidated.

Laws providing for the separation of the sexes will also be invalidated, except as such laws maintain the public interest or the individual's right to privacy. In the case of public restrooms, for example, the individual's right to privacy would take precedence.

The chapters which follow will consider aspects of some of the above laws.

FOOTNOTES

1. Art. I, sec. 28, May 1971.
2. *Di Florido* v. *Di Florido*, 331 A.2d 174 (Sup Ct. 1975).
3. *Cooper* v. *Cooper*, 513 S.W. 2d 22g (Ct. of Civil Appeals, 1974). The following year the same court amplified its interpretation in *Friedman* v. *Friedman*, 521 S.W. 2d. 111 with the following. "It

only provides that each parent has the equal obligation, in accordance with his or her ability, to contribute money or *services* which are necessary for the support and maintenance of his or her children" (emphasis supplied).

4. Com. Ex. Rel. *Buonocore* v. *Buonocore*, 340 A. 2d. 579, 1975.

5. The Wyoming and Utah provisions were adopted prior to 1900 and have not been interpreted consistent with modern understanding of an equal rights amendment.The Virginia amendment includes an exception permitting separation of the sexes and has been interpreted by the Virginia Supreme Court as permitting women to decline jury service without reason. The Illinois ERA uses the "equal protection" language of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, but the Illinois Supreme Court has interpreted the amendment in as strict a fashion as the courts of other states have interpreted ERA's worded like the federal ERA. *People* v. *Ellis*, 311 N.E. 2d 98, 1974.

6. Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, *Women in 1971*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wash., D.C. 20402, p. 36.

7. *People* v. *Green*, 514 P. 2d 769 (Sup. Ct., 1973). *People* v. *Medrano*, 321 N.E. 2d 97 (Appellate Ct. of Ill., 1974). *Brooks* v. *Maryland*, 330 A. 2d 670 (Ct. of Spec. Appeals, 1975). *Finley* v. *Texas*, 527 S.W. 2d 553 (Ct. of Criminal Appeals of Tex., 1975).

8. *Singer* v. *Hara*, 522 P. 2d 1187, (Ct. of Appeals, 1974).

9. In a letter to the *Wall St. Journal* of Oct. 29, 1975, the Governor's Commission said: "Rather than producing a loss of rights or privileges for our citizens, the Amendment has been a stimulus for constructive change and has produced a greater equality of the sexes. Throughout the process of ERA implementation, there has been no intimation whatsoever that the legislature or the courts would thrust inequitable or preposterous measures upon the citizenry of Maryland." Copy of paper on implementation in Maryland is available from the Commission, Shaw House, 21 State Circle, Annapolis, Md. 21404.

10. Paper on "The Impact of the State Equal Rights Amendment on Pennsylvania Since 1971" is available from the Pennsylvania Commission for Women, Office of the Governor, Harrisburg, Pa. 17120.

11. Copies may be secured from the League of Women Voters of New Mexico, 219 Shelby St., Room 211, Santa Fe, N.Mex. 87501.

12. For a discussion of the legislative history of the ERA and its importance, see *Women in 1973*, the annual report of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wash., D.C. 20402, p. 37.

13. National Press Club, Seminar for the Media on the Equal Rights Amendment, Wash., D.C., Apr. 10, 1976.

14. P. 8.

15. Letter of Apr. 24, 1975, from Attorney General of Colo. to Honorable Ruben Valdez, Speaker, House of Representatives and call to Attorney General on Apr. 15, 1976.

16. The *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, Nov. 1957, p. 1.

17. P. 30 ff.

18. At the time of this report, 34 states had already ratified the amendment.

12. ERA--Let the Record Speak

(Reprinted from "... *To Form A More Perfect Union* ...": *Justice for American Women*, Report of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1976.)

Rose Di Florido, a Pennsylvania wife, is entitled to half the household goods at divorce even though her husband paid for them; the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has so ruled in interpreting the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in the State Constitution.[1]

Under Pennsylvania law, prior to that amendment, she would have been entitled only to what she could prove she had paid for. The court in 1975 said, "... we cannot accept an approach that would have ownership of household items on proof of funding alone, since to do so would ... fail to acknowledge the *equally* important and often substantial nonmonetary contributions made by either spouse.[2]

Mrs. Corinne F. Cooper, a Texas homemaker for 16 years with custody of the minor children, was awarded at divorce more than half the community property and $1,500 monthly in child support, plus expenses for private school not to exceed $6,000 per year, and all medical and dental expenses incurred by them. Her husband, a wealthy physician, appealed on the grounds that the award was in conflict with the state ERA.[3] With respect to the award of property the Court of Civil Appeals said, "The difference in earning capacity and business opportunities would justify an unequal division of the community property."

The Court also upheld the child support award stating:

> "If 'equality under the law shall not be denied or abridged because of sex,' it must be presumed that the legislature intended that the duty of the spouse[s] to support their minor children is equal. This does not mean, however, that the court must divide the burden of support of the minor children equally between the parties. The court's order in this respect should reflect a due consideration of the respective abilities of the spouses to contribute. The duty to support is not limited to the bare necessities. The court may consider the standards of living which the parties have maintained in the past . . ."

Bernard J. Buonocore, whose wife "separated herself from her husband and their children" leaving two minor children in his care, secured child support from his wife.[4] Her income was almost as large as his. The Superior Court of Pennsylvania said that in light of the enactment of the ERA, ". . . it is clear that both parents have an obligation to share in the support of their children to the extent of their financial capacity and ability."

The constitutions of 15 states include provisions explicitly prohibiting sex discrimination in the law.[5] The Women's Law Project of Philadelphia, under contract with the Commission, has collected the reported judicial interpretations from these states and found the fears of opponents unrealized.

Indeed, as indicated by the cases cited above, fairer decisions at divorce to homemakers, to children, and to husbands are resulting from state ERA's. The divorce cases are of great significance, for the legally enforceable support obligations of spouses toward each other and the children are spelled out at divorce.[6]

Rape laws have not been invalidated by state ERA's. State courts in Colorado, Illinois, Maryland, and Texas have all upheld rape provisions protecting only women and penalizing men, or penalizing men more severely.[7]

No laws prohibiting homosexual marriage have been invalidated,[8] and no laws providing for separate toilets have been overturned.

A member of the Board of Directors of the League of

Women Voters of New York wrote to the governors of the states that have ERAs in their constitutions, asking whether women had lost any rights under the state ERA, whether public restrooms or sleeping quarters in public institutions or prison cells had been required to be integrated, and whether implementations had been costly or unwieldy.

Replies—all in the negative on all questions—were received from Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Maryland, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming.

The following excerpts were particularly enlightening.

Alaska from Lou Anne Maxwell, Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, February 10, 1976:

> "Women have not lost any rights in Alaska. To the contrary, although we have no actual studies to prove it, credit, housing, and employment have improved. Women are becoming more aware of their rights and the records of the State Human Rights Commission clearly indicate this—40 percent of the complaints filed are based on sex discrimination. Many women are being employed in jobs not usually open to women. For instance, there are now approximately 1,900 women employed on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline."

Maryland from Ellen Luff, Counsel, Governor's Commission to Study Implementation of the Equal Rights Amendment, January 14, 1976:[9]

> "The allegations which have been made about Maryland which you repeat in your letter must be categorically denied. Specifically: (1) Maryland women have *not* lost rights or privileges because of the Equal Rights Amendment; (2) The legislature has *not* mandated sexual integration of public restrooms, prison cells, or sleeping quarters of public institutions; and (3) Implementation of the state ERA has been *neither* costly nor unwieldy."
>
> . . . . .
>
> It is unfortunate that the ERA opponents in various places have been able to make such an effective stand based on such obviously false statements.

Pennsylvania from Marie R. Keeney, Director, Commission for Women, January 21, 1976:[10]

> "1. Pennsylvania women have not lost rights or privileges because of the equal rights provision, nor will they when the

federal ERA is ratified. To the contrary, women are in a stronger position, particularly in the domestic relations area as a result of the ERA. This is due to the fact that Pennsylvania is not a common property state, so before the ERA, women had no rights to the household goods in the case of divorce. Our Supreme Court has ruled that, thanks to the ERA, such property must be regarded as the equal property of husband and wife, and must be so divided in the case of divorce. In the case of alimony, new legislation has been passed that makes alimony during the divorce proceedings available to the economically dependent spouse, but this has not altered the rights of women who have not been the primary wage earners. Furthermore, in support cases, the Supreme Court has ruled that the contributions of the homemaker to the care of the children must be considered as an economic contribution in assessing the relative support obligations. So, for the first time, women's work in the home is legally recognized.

"2. There has been neither a mandate nor any action to integrate public restrooms, sleeping quarters in public institutions or prison cells. Absolutely no invasion of privacy in these areas has been encountered in the nearly five years the amendment has been in effect.

"3. Implementation has not proven costly or unwieldy, although the necessary statutory changes cannot be expected to occur with no special assignment of staff and effort. In Pennsylvania, the Commission for Women has the responsibility from Governor Shapp to oversee implementation of the ERA, and has completed the statutory review phase of this project. We are devoting a portion of our budget to insure that this process moves as rapidly as possible, but the requirements to date are certainly not unreasonable."

Washington from Governor Daniel J. Evans, February 5, 1976:

"I am aware of no classification of 'privileges' which a woman has lost because of adoption of the ERA. Alimony is awarded on a very limited basis in this state because of the Community Property Law. Adoption of the ERA and the implementing dissolution law merely makes it clear that either spouse may sue for support. A women has not lost her right to be supported by her husband; rather she never had such a right. Support within a marriage has been a matter of custom and has never been guaranteed by law.

"The accusations concerning integration of facilities are so ridiculous, we in Washington have ceased to reply to them. Rights of privacy remain fully protected in this state, and thus our restroom facilities, prison cells, and sleeping quarters of public institutions remain totally segregated.

"The passage of the Equal Rights Amendment has brought Washington State a new commitment to the right of equal treatment for all our citizens. While there have undoubtedly been some costs incurred, they are far outweighed by the benefits."

With the letter from the Governor of *New Mexico* was enclosed a publication of the League of Women Voters of New Mexico summarizing the more important statutory changes resulting from the state ERA, including the right for wives of co-management of community property.[11]

The experience with State ERA's is particularly reassuring. State courts in interpreting state constitutions do not have legislative committee reports and debate in the legislature as a guide to the intent of the provision in question, as federal courts have in interpreting the federal Constitution. Nevertheless the state courts have almost universally made decisions in accord with the legislative history of the federal ERA.[12]

Furthermore, the state legislatures, contrary to the predictions of opponents, have acted responsibly in legislating to implement the state ERAs. Washington has completely revised its laws with no loss of rights for women. New Mexico has an almost completed revision.

Many states without state constitutional amendments have made numerous changes in their laws since 1972 to bring them into alignment with ERA requirements. Wisconsin passed an omnibus bill not only revising its laws but directing administrative agencies to bring all of the administrative code into compliance.

ERAmerica. The many national organizations supporting the ERA, which had long recognized the need for a national ERA educational program and a single authoritative source to provide factual information about the ERA, asked the ERA Committee to play a catalyst role. In response the Equal Rights Committee of the Commission brought together the organizations supporting the amendment and experts in carrying on campaigns.

ERAmerica was the result. ERAmerica, co-chaired by Liz Carpenter and Elly Peterson, is a private umbrella organization, privately funded, and completely independent of the Commission.

Continued Need for ERA. While the debate about the ERA has led to many positive changes, these do not reduce the need for the amendment.

All of the laws could be easily changed, and new threats to equality of rights under the law could be mounted under new guises if a guarantee is not enshrined in the Constitution.

Furthermore, the new laws are not universal. For example, five of the eight community property states have given wives co-management rights, but three have not. Only a few states have recognized the contribution of the homemaker as a factor to be considered in dividing property at divorce.

Another important reason why the ERA is necessary is the leverage it gives for seeking the fundamental changes in domestic relations and property law—changes that will achieve the Commission's goal of marriage as a full partnership.

Role of Media. Why, with the need established—an excellent legislative history and widespread support—has the ERA not already been ratified? It has the support of both parties, all recent Presidents, the American Bar Association, unions, church organizations, and practically all women's groups with a tradition of action in behalf of women.

A campaign to discredit the ERA, which has confused the public, has been mounted by ad hoc organizations, such as Stop ERA, Happiness of Womanhood, and Operation Awake. Statements of effects on the law of the ERA have been circulated. Many of the statements are distortions, half truths, or outright misrepresentations.

As Eileen Shanahan, the distinguished *New York Times* reporter, told a seminar for the press on the ERA,[13] it has been difficult for the press to report the ERA because the typically short press deadlines make it all but impossible to check out Phyllis Schlafly's "systematic misrepresentations." Mrs. Schlafly leads opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment.

Susan Dellar Ross, coauthor of a textbook *Sex Discrimination and the Law* and author of *The Rights of Women*, urged in the same seminar that the press must distinguish between policy and legal issues. Constitutional authorities should be consulted on legal issues, she said, and lay persons on policy issues.

Jill Ruckelshaus in a speech at the National Press Club on September 12, 1975, drew attention to the imbalance of media coverage that gives the same weight to the opinions of the Stop ERA forces as to the majority report of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the amendment. "This isn't a question of one opinion about the ERA having equal standing with a contrary opinion," she said:

> "When the courts interpret the Equal Rights Amendment, they will not turn to a Stop ERA pamphlet; rather, they will look to the one authentic piece of legislative history we have: the Senate Judiciary Committee report on the Amendment, which answers well many of the questions Amendment opponents are raising. To balance a Stop ERA opinion against the Senate Judiciary Report is to be off balance in objective, informed reporting. The two just aren't equal, and to report them as such in the media is to give a misleading impression."

Again in an article in *The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors* for March 1976, she stressed the importance of in-depth reporting:

> "We are happy that many newspapers support ERA on their editorial pages, basing those endorsements on informed interpretations of what ERA will mean. But we are dismayed by the number of newspapers across the country which have not done an in-depth news analysis of ERA and which, either in ignorance or under a false assumption of fairness, have perpetuated inaccurate information spread by ERA opponents.[14]

When former Congresswoman Martha Griffiths and leaders of the opponents are quoted as equally credible authorities, the public is sadly misled. Congresswoman Griffiths was the leading proponent of the ERA in the House of Representatives and her views expressed there will be quoted by judges to support their interpretations of the ERA.

When a charge that the Colorado ERA has resulted in legalizing homosexual marriage is quoted without checking with Colorado authorities, the readers or hearers are denied the truth. This story, which has been repeated in many states, is typical of the misrepresentations. It is true that a local clerk issued marriage licenses to men, but it is also true that Attorney General of Colorado held the licenses invalid.[15] It is also true that the District Attorney who advised the clerk thought the marriage law, not the ERA, authorized the licenses.

Another example of a misrepresentation that has gained widespread publicity is a charge that the Ohio Task Force Report for the implementation of the Equal Rights Amendment says that "ERA will require government-financed childcare centers . . ."[16]

The report says no such thing. The task force made recommendations for changes in law required to implement the ERA *and* changes that Ohio women wanted based on hearings throughout the state. It is clear in the report that the recommendation on child care is in the second category of desired changes. Even after this distinction was pointed out to opponents, they continued to make this false charge in speeches. Even a large number of letters to the editors by the Ohio Task Force cannot seem to catch up with this falsehood.

There are hopeful signs that some newspapers and radio and TV stations are attempting to give more sophisticated coverage. *The New York Times Magazine* for April 11, 1976, included an excellent article, "You'll Probably Think I'm Stupid" by Martha Veinman Lear,[17] describing the distortions and misrepresentations of the opponents.

On the other hand, the National Press Club ERA seminar referred to above attracted few reporters, although it was an excellent program designed to help reporters give intelligent coverage to the ERA.

ERAmerica and the Commission will continue to stress reliable in-depth media coverage, confident that an accurately informed public will assure that the required 38 states will have ratified by March 1979 the proposed 27th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Equal Rights Amendment.[18]

13. Careers and Occupational Outlook

(Reprinted from *Careers for Women in the 70's,* Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.)

Careers for women should not be any different from careers for men. Decisions with respect to gainful and satisfying employment for women should be made on the basis of occupational outlook and the demand for workers in the growth occupations as well as on individual interests and capabilities. Just how women can capitalize on the growth occupation demands will depend on a variety of factors.

First, women need better career planning and counseling. They should be encouraged to develop personal goals based upon occupational information that will enable them to compete for good jobs in light of their abilities, desires, and training. Career guidance should begin at the junior high school level, or even at the elementary school level, with the assistance of counselors, teachers, and parents.

Second, some women must change their career aspirations. Since openings in the usual "women's" occupations will not be sufficient to supply jobs for all women seeking work, they must choose alternatives in nontraditional occupations. Many of these jobs pay higher wages and offer greater opportunities for promotion. In the past, too many women were forced to settle for second best in jobs. Others are willing to settle for the lesser jobs because they felt that their stay in the labor force would be temporary. However, the situation is changing as more and more women become aware of the probability of combining the roles of wife, mother, and homemaker with that of paid worker.

Third, women must fully utilize the sources of legal protection and assistance which are available to them. Strong laws against discrimination in employment on the basis of sex are on the books. Having the legislation, however, is not enough. It is up to women to press for enforcement of the laws where necessary. "Affirmative action," in accordance with the requirements of Revised Order No. 4, will enhance the entry of women into many fields previously "reserved" for men. This should help speed up the process of eliminating the discriminatory and illegal sex labels attached to jobs.

Fourth, and possibly one of the most difficult areas to deal with, is the need to change employer attitudes with respect to women's roles and desire to work. Perhaps the overriding factors in this regard are the myths that employers, policymakers, and others in our society have unfairly associated with the worklife patterns of women. One such myth is that women are not seriously attached to the labor force, as they work only for "pocket money." However, of the 33 million women in the labor force in March 1972, more than half were working because of pressing economic need. These women comprise a group who are either single, widowed, divorced, separated, or married to men with incomes of less than $5,000 a year. Women constitute nearly two-fifths of the work force. However, because of foregone conclusions about their interests and capabilities, women are disproportionately restricted in the kinds of jobs they hold. Their concentration in the less rewarding, lower paying occupations provides them with fewer chances for advancement.

On the other hand, some progress is being made concerning employer attitudes. In contrast to the practices of just a few years ago when most companies did not actively recruit college women but employed a few upon application, many companies are now seeking positive ways to establish equal opportunity programs. Some companies have indicated that they would hire more college women if they were qualified for the fields of accounting, engineering, data processing, mathematics, general business, chemistry, marketing, and economics (finance). Many women do not prepare for these fields because they lack the necessary background, having been channeled away from advanced (and sometimes even basic) courses in mathematics and science while in high school. Girls should, therefore, include more of these fundamentals to provide them with an adequate background to prepare for better employment opportunities in the future.

The concept of personal choice in the world of work will begin to become a reality when all concerned—for example, the guidance counselor, the shop teacher, the plant employer, and women themselves—are able to develop an appreciation for the differences in personal abilities and desires. This should have great impact for the girl who grew up helping her father do the car or tractor repairs and has a knack for this kind of work. Why shouldn't she work as and receive the pay of a mechanic? And in speaking of individual differences, it goes a step further, too—if a man likes caring for the sick, why shouldn't he become a nurse?

14. Title IX of the Education Amendments, 1972

(Reprinted from *A Guide to Federal Laws and Regulations Prohibiting Sex Discrimination*, Clearinghouse Publication No. 46, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 1976, revised.)

Most educational institutions across the United States receive federal financial assistance; these include preschool programs, elementary and secondary school systems, four-year colleges and universities, vocational and technical schools, two-year community and junior colleges, and graduate and professional schools. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972[1] and HEW's Title IX regulations[2] prohibits educational institutions which receive federal funds from discriminating on the basis of sex.

Coverage. This prohibition covers educational programs, employment, health benefits, housing, athletics, admissions, and financial aid, and all other programs and services of the institution, except fraternities and sororities.[3] Military schools and schools operated by religious organizations whose tenets are inconsistent with the provisions of Title IX, are exempt from coverage.

Vocational, professional, graduate, and public undergraduate schools may not discriminate on the basis of sex in admissions, but private undergraduate schools, schools which have traditionally admitted only individuals of one sex, and public and private preschools, elementary and secondary schools (except where such schools are vocational) are exempt from the provisions with regard to admissions only. Schools which are in transition from single-sex to co-educational institutions are allowed seven years to complete the process, during which they may continue to make admissions decisions on the basis of sex.

Examples of discrimination forbidden by these amendments include: refusal of a board of education to hire or promote qualified women as principals in the school system, refusal of a college to provide housing of comparable quality and cost to students of both sexes, or maintenance of sex-segregated classes in business, vocational, technical, home economics, music, and adult education courses or programs.

What Is Required. An education program or activity receiving federal funds must afford employees, students, and potential employees and students equal employment opportunity and equal opportunity to participate in and receive the benefits of all educational programs and activities, without regard to sex.

Specific obligations include the following:

All educational institutions are required to refrain from sex discrimination (except as otherwise noted). Where the director of HEW's Office for Civil Rights finds that an institution has discriminated on the basis of sex in an education program or activity, the institution must take remedial action to overcome the effects of such discrimination. However, in the absence of a determination of prior acts of discrimination based on sex, the institution is not required to act affirmatively to overcome limited participation by persons of a particular sex, although it may choose to do so.

Generally, institutions may not utilize tests, counseling, or recruiting methods which have a disproportionately adverse effect on persons on the basis of sex, either for admission to programs or activities or for employment. In admissions, testing or counseling materials may be different for males and females if they cover the same interest areas and occupations and the use of such different materials is shown to be essential to eliminate sex bias. In employment, testing may be different for males and females if it is shown to be valid in predicting successful performance and if alternatives are unavailable. Recruitment of members of one sex may be used remedially to overcome the effects of past discrimination, but may not otherwise be used if it has a discriminatory effect.

Institutions may not make pre-admission or pre-employment inquires about actual or potential marital, parental, or family status of individuals. For both students and employees, childbirth, pregnancy, termination of pregnancy and recovery therefrom must be treated as any other temporary disability. In the absence of a leave policy, the institution must treat these factors as a justification for a leave of absence without pay for a reasonable period of time, at the conclusion of which the employee must be reinstated in a comparable position without a decrease in pay, privileges, and/or promotional opportunities. Students must be reinstated at their previous status and may not be discriminated against or excluded from a program or activity unless they voluntarily request to participate in a separate program or activity.

If the institution participates in the administration of scholarships, awards, or fellowships which discriminate on the basis of sex, it must provide reasonable opportunities for similar awards for members of the other sex. In the case of athletics, the institution must provide reasonable opportunities for scholarship awards for members of each sex in proportion to the number of students of each sex participating in interscholastic or intercollegiate athletics.

Institutions may provide separate housing based on sex, but may not impose different rules, fees, or requirements or provide different benefits to one sex. Housing for women and men must be comparable in quality and cost and proportionate in quantity to the number of students of each sex applying for it.

Institutions may provide separate toilet, locker room, and shower facilities on the basis of sex, but the facilities provided for students of one sex must be comparable to those provided for students of the other sex.

The use of particular textbooks and other curricular materials are not prohibited by Title IX, regardless of content. However, courses, programs, and activities may not be segregated by sex except in the case of choruses with vocal range requirements resulting in a single sex chorus, courses on human sexuality on the elementary and secondary level, and body contact sports. Physical education programs on the elementary level must be integrated by July 21, 1976, and by July 21, 1978, above the elementary level.

Separate athletic teams may be maintained for sports involving competitive skills and body contact. For non-contact sports only, if no separate team for a particular sport exists for one sex and previous opportunities were limited for that sex to participate, all persons must be permitted to try out for the existing team. Teams for contact sports may remain single-sex, even if no team is available for the excluded sex. Institutions are permitted to make unequal aggregate and per capita expenditures for members of each sex on a team or for separate male and female teams so long as this does not interfere with equality of opportunity for members of each sex. Necessary funds must be provided for teams for each sex.

Complaints. Each institution must adopt and publish complaint procedures and designate at least one employee to carry out its Title IX responsibilities, including investigation of complaints. The institution must notify all students and employees of the appointed employee's name, office address, and telephone number.

In addition, a complaint may be filed with the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by any person (or a representative) who believes herself or himself or either sex as a class to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title IX. The written complaint should be filed with:

Director, Office for Civil Rights
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
330 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Complaints must be filed within 180 days of the alleged discrimination, but HEW may extend this deadline.

HEW may investigate where a complaint has been made or where there are other indications that the educational institution is discriminating on the basis of sex. HEW will informally attempt to bring the institution into compliance with the requirements of Title IX. Once a complaint has been filed, the complainant is no longer involved, and it is the responsibility of HEW to resolve it.

Enforcement and Sanctions. In addition to investigations initiated by a complaint, HEW may conduct periodic compliance reviews. Where an educational institution is found to be discriminating on the basis of sex and HEW finds that this cannot be corrected informally, it may terminate or refuse to grant funds to the institution. Before such action may be taken, HEW must allow an opportunity for a hearing and must find that there will not be voluntary compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements. In addition, HEW may refer the matter to the Attorney General of the United States with a recommendation that legal action be taken, or take any other action authorized by law.

FOOTNOTES

1. 20 U.S.C.§1681 *et seq.* (Supp. IV, 1974).

2. 40 Fed. Reg. 24137 (1975) (to be codified at 45 C.F.R. Part 86). Included as Appendix IV of this handbook.

3. 20 U.S.C. §1681(a) (6) (Supp. IV, 1974) exempts fraternities and sororities from the provisions of Title IX.

15. Title IX and Grievance Procedures

(Reprinted from *Title IX Grievance Procedures: An Introductory Manual,* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Martha Matthews and Shirley McCune.)

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 requires that:

> No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The regulation to implement Title IX, issued by the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (OCR/HEW), became effective on July 21, 1975. It specifies detailed prohibitions of sex discrimination in education agencies and institutions receiving federal funds. Sex discrimination is prohibited in:

- Admissions to most schools

- Treatment of students, including:

  —access to programs and courses
  —access to and use of school facilities
  —counseling and guidance materials, tests, and practices
  —vocational education
  —physical education
  —competitive athletics
  —graduation requirements
  —student rules, regulations, and benefits
  —the treatment of married and/or pregnant students
  —housing
  —financial assistance
  —health services
  —school-sponsored extracurricular activities
  —most other aid, benefits, or services

- Employment

  —access to employment, including:
    - recruitment policies and practices
    - advertising
    - application procedures
    - testing and interviewing practices

  —hiring and promotion, including:
    - selection practices
    - application of nepotism policies
    - demotion, lay off, termination
    - tenure

  —compensation, including:
    - wages and salaries
    - extra compensations

  —job assignments, including:
    - classification and position descriptions
    - lines of progression
    - seniority lists
    - assignment and placement

- —leaves of absence, including:
  - leaves for temporary disability
  - childbearing leave and related medical conditions
  - childrearing leave
- —fringe benefits, including:
  - insurance plans
  - retirement plans
  - vacation time
  - travel opportunities
  - selection and support for training
  - employer-sponsored programs
- —labor organization contracts or professional agreements

The regulation also provides that complaints alleging Title IX violations by a recipient agency or institution may be filed with the Office for Civil Rights, HEW. OCR has the authority to investigate complaints, or to review compliance in the absence of complaints. If violations are found, OCR may attempt to achieve compliance through conciliation, institute administrative proceedings to terminate federal funds, or refer the case to the Department of Justice for court action to effect compliance without termination, withholding, or denial of eligibility for federal funds.

One of the unique aspects of the Title IX regulation is its delineation of procedures which education agencies and institutions receiving federal funds are required to implement in order to ensure and monitor compliance with Title IX requirements for nondiscrimination. Two of these required procedures—one for the designation of an employee responsible for the coordination of agency or institutional efforts to comply with Title IX, the other for the adoption and publication of an internal grievance procedure for the resolution of complaints[1] under Title IX—place responsibility on the agency or institution for the establishment and maintenance of a mechanism whereby students and employees may seek an end to and redress from illegal sex discrimination and whereby the agency or institution may continually be apprised of and evaluate possible discriminatory policies and practices and develop its own strategies or programs for the correction of discrimination.

These two provisions of the Title IX regulation read as follows:

> §86.8 Designation of responsible employee and adoption of grievance procedures.
> (a) Designation of responsible employee. Each recipient shall designate at least one employee to coordinate its efforts to comply with and carry out its responsibilities under this . . . [regulation], including any investigation of any complaint communicated to such recipient alleging any actions which would be prohibited by this . . . [regulation]. The recipient shall notify all its students and employees of the name, office, address and telephone number of the employee or the employees appointed pursuant to this paragraph.
> (b) Complaint procedure of recipient. A recipient shall adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of student and employee complaints alleging any action which would be prohibited by this . . . [regulation].

All recipient agencies and institutions were required to comply with these requirements by July 21, 1976.

With its issuance of the regulation to implement Title IX, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that the primary intent of these two provisions is to "facilitate compliance and prompt correction of complaints without resort to Federal involvement." The existence of an agency or institutional grievance procedure does not affect the right of an individual or group to file a federal complaint regarding possible Title IX violations with the Office for Civil Rights, HEW, without utilizing the internal procedure of the agency or institution, simultaneously with the filing of an internal grievance, or after the unsatisfactory resolution of a grievance under the agency/institutional procedure. A usable and effective agency or institutional procedure can, however, minimize the complainant's need for recourse to the federal process, and offer both the complainant and the agency or institution the prospect of an expeditious resolution of issues and the development of compliance activities which are best suited to the particular situation involved.

In order to facilitate the implementation of a grievance procedure which can most effectively meet the needs of an individual education agency or institution and its students and employees, the Title IX regulation does not specify a structure for the grievance procedure. It requires only that the procedure provide for the "prompt and equitable resolution of student and employee complaints."

Note: For detailed and comprehensive information in this area, we suggest *Title IX Grievance Procedures: An Introductionary Manual*, available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price $2.50, Stock No. 017-080-01711-3.

FOOTNOTE

1. The terms "complaint" and "grievance" are used apparently interchangeably within §86.8 of the regulation to implement Title IX. This manual shall follow the regulation of this interchangeable usage: an allegation of noncompliance with Title IX made within the structure of an internal procedure shall be referred to as either a "complaint" or a "grievance." An allegation of noncompliance which is filed with the Office for Civil Rights, HEW, shall be referred to as a "Federal complaint."

16. The Dualist Theory of Human Resources

(Reprinted from *Women and Work*, R & D Monograph 46, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1977.)

The dual labor market theory raises a provocative issue about women and work. In its extreme statement, the theory argues that there is a castelike division between sectors of the labor market.[1] The primary sector (or high caste) offers the good jobs: high wages, good working conditions, job security, advancement, equity, and due process in administering rules. The secondary sector offers the poor jobs: low wages and benefits, poor working conditions, job insecurity, few chances for advancement, and arbitrary supervision.

According to the dualists, minorities, and to some extent women, are more likely than others to be assigned to occupations and industries in the secondary sector and to be held there by an almost impenetrable barrier of discrimination.

Andrisani, testing the dualist theory with data from the National Longitudinal Survey of male workers, found that barriers between sectors were clearly present.[2] It is "at odds with the facts to suggest that equivalent levels of human capital, motivation, and demand render opportunities equal.[3] He also found, however, that the barriers were not impenetrable and that many people moved back and forth between primary and secondary sectors.

Other analysts stress the job disadvantages of women that result from inadequate investments in education, training, and other human capital resources, and they propose policies aimed at overcoming these disadvantages.

Dualists tend to view such policies as insufficient, or even futile and wasteful, in the presence of institutional discrimination. Increasing the general demand for labor (through full employment) and improving the employability of women (through education and training), while important in their view, are not enough to overcome discrimination and job disadvantages.

Some dualists talk about a "human capital overkill," and insist that educational credentials are overemphasized and unrelated to job requirements or productivity. Instead they may stress such policies as strong and enforced anti-discrimination laws, the restructuring of jobs to offer more opportunities to women, the reduction of irrelevant credentialism, unionization of the secondary sector, increased minimum wages, negative income taxes or other devices for redistributing money and power.

Many dualists believe that discrimination is so entrenched that even high levels of labor demand will not easily dislodge it. Under conditions of increased demand, they say, employers will simply divert their hiring to the secondary sector (through temporary help or subcontracting) or bid up the pay of available primary workers, rather than draw secondary workers into the primary sector. In this context, mainly prime age white men are primary workers, and secondary workers are mainly women, minorities of both sexes, the old, the young, and the handicapped.

The main policy question raised in this discussion is, To what extent is the labor market disadvantage of women and others the result of shortcomings in their education, training, motivation, commitment to work, and work experience, and to what extent is that disadvantage attributable to inequities and discrimination in the labor market, or to inadequate demand?

Like most researchers, Andrisani found a rather close association between educational attainment and job status. In other words, the greater the human resources, the higher the job status tends to be. Women of the same educational attainment as men, however, tend to have a markedly lower job status. Education and training, then, have a significantly lower payoff for women than for men, although the payoff for women is nonetheless real and present. Thus, both education and discrimination apparently have important effects on the work women do.

The dual labor market and the human capital perspectives call attention to the extensive job segregation of women and the extent to which discrimination, stereotyping, and traditional roles confine some women to a secondary labor market, some to the less desirable jobs in the primary market, and permit very few to enter the more desirable primary market jobs.

Clearly, the operations of the dual labor market require further exploration. Analyses similar to Andrisani's, using data on female as well as male workers, would be helpful, as would inquiries into the effect of law, political organization, unionization,and changes in aggregate demand on job segregation.

The so-called women's occupations derive not from innate aptitudes but from stereotyped roles and from long traditions of dominance and subservience which a democratic society is necessarily committed to alter.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Peter B. Doeringer and Michael J. Piore, *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1971). ETA-ORD—NTIS, PB 193079. See also Garth I., Mangum, "Manpower Research and Manpower Policy," Benjamin Aaron *et al.*, ed., in *A Review of Industrial Relations Research* (Madison, Wis.: Industrial Relations Research Association, 1971), vol. II.

2. Paul Andrisani, *An Empirical Analysis of the Dual Labor Market Theory* (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1973). ETA-ORD—NTIS. PB 225528.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Adams, Ruth. *A Woman's Place.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1977

Ahlum, Carol, and Fralley, Jacqueline M. *High School Feminist Studies.* Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1976.

Alfrey, Jean. *Equal Rights for Women in Education: A Resource Handbook for Policy Makers.* Denver, Col.: Education Commission of the States, Equal Rights for Women in Education Project, 1976.

Berk, L. E., and Lewis, N. G. "Sex Role and Social Behavior in Four School Environments." *Elementary School Journal* 77:204–17; January 1977.

Bickel, P. J., and others. "Sex Bias in Graduate Admissions: Data from Berkeley." *Science* 187:398–404; February 7, 1975.

Bird, Caroline. *Enterprising Women.* New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1976.

Blakey, William A. "Everybody Makes the Revolution." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:11–19; Spring 1974.

Blaxall, Martha, and Reagan, Barbara R., eds. *Women and the Workplace: The Implications of Occupational Segregation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Bullough, Vern, and Bullough, Bonnie. *The Subordinate Sex: A History of Attitudes Toward Women.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973.

Cantor, M. G. "Women & Public Broadcasting: Summary of the Report of the Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting." *Journal of Communication* 27:14–19; Winter 1977.

Cardenas, Blandina, and Cardenas, J. A. "Chicano: Bright-Eyed, Bilingual, Brown, and Beautiful." *Today's Education* 62:49–51; February 1973.

Carney, Clarke G., and McMahon, S. Lynne. *Exploring Contemporary Male-Female Roles: A Facilitator's Guide.* San Diego, Calif.: University Associates, 1977.

Chafe, William H. *Women & Equality: Changing Patterns in American Culture.* Fairlawn, N.J.: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Chapman, Jane R., and Gates, Margaret. *Women Into Wives: The Legal & Economic Impact of Marriage.* (Yearbooks in Women's Policy Studies: Vol. 2). Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc., 1977.

Chevigny, Bell Gale. *The Margaret Fuller Reader.* Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1976.

Clark, L. "Fact & Fantasy: A Recent Profile of Women in Academia." *Peabody Journal of Education* 54:103–109; January 1977.

Crawford, C. "Status of Black Women." *Ebony* 30:26; March 1975.

Curtis, Jean. *Working Mothers.* New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1976.

Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation.* Boston: Beacon Press, Inc., 1973.

Diamond, Irene. *Sex Roles in the State House.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977.

Diner, Helen. *Mothers and Amazons.* Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1973.

Frazier, Nancy, and Sadker, Myra. *Sexism in School and Society.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973.

Gee, Emma. "Issei: The First Women." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:48–53; Spring 1974.

Glickman, J. "Hints for Combating Sexism." *American Education* 11:34–35; March 1975.

Gold, S. "Sex Stereotyping in the School." *Education Canada* 17:22–27; Spring 1977.

Gould, Carol C., and Wartofsky, Marx W. *Women & Philosophy: Toward a Theory of Liberation.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1976.

Grambs, Jean Dresden, ed. *Teaching About Women in the Social Studies—Concepts, Methods, and Materials.* Arlington, Va.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1976.

Grambs, J. D. "Women & Administration: Confrontation or Accommodation?" *Theory into Practice* 15:293–300; October 1976.

"Guidelines for Equal Editorial Treatment of the Sexes; Excerpts from McGraw-Hill Memo." *Today's Education* 64:53; January 1975.

Guttentag, Marcia, and Bray, Helen. *Undoing Sex Stereotypes: Research & Resources for Educators*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Hargreaves, D. J. "Sex Roles in Divergent Thinking." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 47:25–32; February 1977.

Harriman, L. C. "Changing Roles: Implications for Home Economics." *Journal of Home Economics* 69:11–13; March 1977.

Hernandez, Aileen. "Small Change for Black Women." *Ms.* 3:16–18; August 1974.

Hill, H. "Anti-Oriental Agitation and the Rise of Working Class Racism: 1850–1920." *Society* 10:43–48; January 1973.

Hole, Judith, and Levine, Ellen. *Rebirth of Feminism*. New York: Quadrangle, 1973.

Horn, J. "Stereotyping: It Starts Young and Dies Hard." *Psychology Today* 8:854; January 1975.

Horton, P. B. "Sexless Vocabulary for a Sexist Society." *Education Digest* 42:36–38; March 1977.

Howe, Florence. "Sexism, Racism, and the Education of Women." *Today's Education* 62:47–48; May 1973.

Huber, Joan, editor. *Changing Women in a Changing Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Johnston, Johanna. *Women Themselves*. New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1973.

Jung, Betty. "Chinese Immigrants." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:46–47; Spring 1974.

Kahn, Kathy. *Hillbilly Women*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1973.

Kearns, Martha. *Kathe Kollwitz: Woman and the Artist*. Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1976.

King, Lourdes Miranda. "Puertorriquenas in the United States." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:20–28; Spring 1974.

Komisar, Lucy. *New Feminism*. New York: Franklin Watts, Inc., 1971.

Lehmann, P. "Cutting Sex Bias Out of Vocational Education." *Education Digest* 42:33–35; March 1977.

Lerner, Gerda. *Black Women in White America: A Documentary History*. New York: Random House, 1973.

Lovier, R. "I am Mind: Mujer Integrate Ahora." *Ms.* 3:18, February 1975.

McDowell, M. B. "New Didacticism: Stories for Free Children." *Language Arts* 54:41–47+; January 1977.

McLure, Gail T. *Women in Science and Technology: Careers for Today and Tomorrow.* Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1976.

Mason, Bobbie. *The Girl Sleuth: A Feminist Guide.* Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1976.

Merriam, Eve. *Growing Up Female in America.* New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

Michael, J. A. "Women/Men in Leadership Roles in Art Education." *Studies in Art Education* 18 No. 2:7–20; 1977.

Morgan, Robin. *Going Too Far: The Personal Chronicle of a Feminist.* Westminster, Md.: Random House, Inc., 1977.

Myers, Carol Fairbanks. *Women in Literature: Criticism of the Seventies.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976.

Nieto, Consuelo. "Chicanas and the Women's Rights Movement: A Perspective." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:36–42; Spring 1974.

Polowy, C. "Sex Discrimination: The Legal Obligations of Educational Institutions." *Vital Speeches* 41:237–41; February 1975.

Richmond, V. P., and Robertson, D. L. "Women's Liberation in Interpersonal Relations." *Journal of Communication* 27:42–45; Winter 1977.

Rosenfelt, Deborah Silverton. *Strong Women: An Annotated Bibliography for the High School Classroom.* Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1976.

Russell, Diana E., and Van de Ven, Nicole. *Crimes Against Women.* Millbrae, Calif.: Les Femmes Publishing, 1977.

Seifer, Nancy. *Absent from the Majority.* New York: American Jewish Committee, National Project on Ethnic America, 1973.

Silberman, A. "Are the Walls of Sexism Beginning to Tumble?" *Instructor* 86:38; April 1977.

Sipila, H. L. "Women and World Affairs." *Today's Education* 63:66–67; November 1974.

Smudski, M. D. "Sex and the Single Stereotype." *Educational Horizons* 54:167–71; Summer 1976.

Sommers, Tish. "The Compounding Impact of Age on Sex: Another Dimension of the Double Standard." *Civil Rights Digest* 7:2–9; Fall 1974.

Spock, Benjamin. "How Fathers Can Teach Their Children Sexual Equality." *Redbook* 144:22+; January 1975.

Sprung, B. "Non-sexist Education: A New Focus for Early Childhood Programs." *Children Today* 6:2–6; January 1977.

Staples, Robert. *The Black Woman in America.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co., 1973. "Stresses and Strains on Black Women." *Ebony* 29:33–36+; June 1974.

Tanner, L. R. "Sex Bias in Children's Response to Literature." *Language Arts* 54:48–50; January 1977.

Trotter, Virginia. "Women in Leadership and Decision Making." *Vital Speeches* 41:373–75; April 1975.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. *Focus on Women: A Guide to Programs and Research of the Education Division.* Washington, D.C.: Information Materials Center, 1976.

Vidal, Merta. *Chicanas Speak Out: Women, New Voice of La Raza.* New York: Pathfinder Press, Inc., 1971.

Vincenzi, H. "Minimizing Occupational Stereotypes." *The Vocational Guild Quarterly* 25:265–68; March 1977.

Walker, Alice. "In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens: The Creativity of Black Women in the South." *Ms.* 2:64–70; May 1974.

Weitz, Shirley. *Sex Roles: Biological, Psychological & Social Foundations.* Fairlawn, N.J.: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Wells, M. "National Conference on Non-sexist Early Childhood Education: Report." *Instructor* 86:22–23; April 1977.

Wiles, J. and McNamera, D. "From Bionic Woman to Ultra Man: TV's New Stereotypes." *National Elementary Principal* 56:60–61; January 1977.

Williams, B. "Another Blow to the Black Matriarchy Theory." *Psychology Today* 8:22, September 1974.

Williams, Maxine, and others. *Black Women's Liberation.* New York: Pathfinder Press, Inc.

Witt, Shirley Hill. "Native Women Today: Sexism and the Indian Woman." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:29–35; Spring 1974.

Women, Money, & Power. Des Plaines, Ill.: Bantam Books, Inc., 1977.

"Women Shou Chung-Kuo-Hua at Parsippani Hills High School." *Senior Scholastic* 103:21; November 1973.

Women's Work & Women's Studies, 1973–74. Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1977.

Yoshioka, Robert B. "Stereotyping Asian Women." *Civil Rights Digest* 6:45; Spring 1974.